5

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The outstanding cooperation of all who have contributed to this survey and report is hereby gratefully acknowledged.

PREFACE

The terms of reference for this report are set forth in the following letter to the Metropolitan Committee of Heads of Departments:

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO
Clerk's Department

February 22nd, 1961.

G. Arthur Lascelles, Esq., Chairman,
and Members of the Metropolitan
Committee of Heads of Departments.

Gentlemen:

The Special Committee of the Metropolitan Council on Metropolitan Affairs at its meeting held on February 21st, 1961, had before it a communication (February 21st, 1961) from the Chairman, Metropolitan Committee of Heads of Departments, forwarding as requested recommendations as to the procedure to be followed in obtaining "facts and figures" to assist the Special Committee in reaching a decision in favour or against amalgamation of Area Municipalities, as follows:

"(1) that the procedure based on the statement from Mr. Frederick G. Gardiner, Q.C., Chairman of Council, as amended by the Special Committee and further amended by the Metropolitan Committee of Heads of Departments, for the obtaining of 'facts and figures' appended hereto, be approved;

(2) that for the purpose of obtaining the information to be requested from the Heads of the Metropolitan Departments and the Area Municipalities, a standardized questionnaire form be prepared by the Metropolitan Committee of Heads of Departments for distribution to those from whom information is sought, in order that uniformity and a basis of comparison may be achieved in the compilation of this information;

(3) that the Metropolitan Committee of Heads of Departments, if requested, will assume the responsibility for summarizing the information, when received, into a report for submission to the Special Committee of the Metropolitan Council on Metropolitan Affairs;

(4) that the Area Municipalities and the Metropolitan Officials be requested to submit the information required in this connection, to the Metropolitan Clerk on or before April 1st, 1961;

(5) that consideration of 1 (f) contained in the written suggestions of the Chairman of Council as amended by the Special Committee, that information be obtained indicating 'the savings, if any, which would result from amalgamation of the thirteen municipalities and the abolition of the Metropolitan Government', should be deferred for the time being, inasmuch as this proposal calls for conclusions which in the opinion of this Committee cannot be determined until there has been an opportunity to study and evaluate the information received; and

(6) that consideration of the submissions by Mr. George E. Gathercole, Deputy Minister, Department of Economics, Province of Ontario, and Mayor Nathan Phillips also be deferred for the time being, inasmuch as these submissions call for conclusions which in the opinion of this Committee cannot be determined until there has been an opportunity to study and evaluate the information received."

The Special Committee revised the "procedure for obtaining 'facts and figures'," to read as follows:

1. That this Committee request the Committee of Heads of Departments to provide for the Special Committee an organizational chart indicating:

   (a) the administrative structure of the Metropolitan Corporation;

   (b) the Heads of Departments and their salaries;

   (c) the Deputy Heads of Departments and their salaries;

   (d) (i) the number of employees in each Department and the annual salary and wage costs of each Department for the years 1954 to 1960 inclusive;

   (ii) where there is an increase or decrease from one year to another in the total number of staff of any department, please include an explanation for such changes;

(e) a statement by the Head of each Department indicating the functions and work load (or volume of work) of his Department as of December 31, 1960; and to what extent he considers there is overlapping of services in relation to the thirteen local municipalities and the Metropolitan organization; and

(The foregoing underlined words were inserted on the suggestion of Mr. Archer.)

(f) the population and assessment figures by area municipalities and all wards in area municipalities for the years 1954 to 1960 inclusive, together with the land areas in each;

(The foregoing underlined words were inserted on the suggestion of Miss Davidson.)

2. That the Committee of the Heads of Departments request each of the thirteen Area Municipalities to provide such Committee with an organizational chart indicating:

(a) the administrative structure of the area municipality;

(b) the Heads of Departments and their salaries;

(c) the Deputy Heads of Departments or Directors of Divisions and their salaries;

(The foregoing underlined words were inserted on the suggestion of Mr. Archer.)

(d) (i) the number of employees in each Department and the annual salary and wage costs of each Department for the years 1952 to 1960 inclusive;

(ii) where there is an increase or decrease from one year to another in the total number of staff of any department, please include an explanation for such changes;

(e) a statement by the Head of each Department indicating the functions and work load (or volume of work) of his Department as of December 31, 1960; and to what extent he considers there is overlapping of services in relation to the thirteen municipalities and the Metropolitan organization;

(The foregoing underlined words were inserted on the suggestion of Mr. Archer.)

(f) the structure of the Council of the area municipality;

(g) the salaries and other emoluments paid to each member of Council by the municipality and any related Boards, Commissions or Corporations to which he is appointed by reason of his office;

(h) the total expenditure made by each municipality for Council and Committees of Council salary, travelling expenses and any other compensation, for the year 1960; and

(i) details as to the structure, functions and costs for the years 1952 to 1960 inclusive, of all Committees of Council and all Local Boards, Commissions or Corporations which carry out functions of the municipality and for which the municipality is required to levy taxes, indicating the number of hours and the volume of work performed by each;

(The foregoing underlined words were inserted on the suggestion of Mr. Campbell.)

(It was also made clear that School Boards are local boards and therefore are covered by the above wording.)

3. That the Committee of Heads of Departments request the Metropolitan Clerk to prepare the same information as indicated in the foregoing No. 2 (f) to (i) inclusive, as it applies to the Metropolitan Corporation; and

4. That the Committee of Heads of Departments request the Deputy Minister of Economics, in conjunction with the Assistant Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs, to indicate the provincial grants enjoyed for the years 1953 to 1960 inclusive, and the respective losses or gains in provincial grants which would be enjoyed or suffered by each of the municipalities if amalgamation of the thirteen municipalities took place.

(The foregoing underlined words were inserted on the suggestion of Mr. Phillips.)

(On the suggestion of Mr. Phillips the following words were deleter from the end of the foregoing section, viz.:

"on the understanding that this estimate is to be exclusive of any demand which might be made by the thirteen area municipalities as a component part of the new amalgamated municipality, for the same quantity or quality of municipal services now enjoyed by any area municipality".)

The Special Committee adopted the foregoing report of the Metropolitan Committee of Heads of Departments with the above-indicated revisions in the "procedure for obtaining 'facts and figures'"; and directed the said Committee of Heads to proceed accordingly and to assume responsibility for summarizing the information, when received, into a report for submission to this Special Committee.

Yours very truly,

(signed) W.W. Gardhouse

Metropolitan Clerk.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd)

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This report is the result of a survey undertaken in 1961 by the Metropolitan Committee of Heads of Departments at the request of the Metropolitan Council. The survey was conducted by circulating questionnaires to the Metropolitan and local Departments, Boards, Commissions, etc. which would probably be affected by amalgamation.

A standard questionnaire was adopted by the Committee after lengthy consideration. This questionnaire is in two sections plus an appendix. Section 1, which was answered by the Clerk in each municipality deals with the structure of the municipality, its Council and Committees, and its departmental organization. Section 2, which was answered by the head of each department at both the Metropolitan and local levels deals with the details of departmental staff, expenditures, etc. The appendix to the questionnaire contains detailed instructions to certain specified departments concerning the form their answers should take.

A copy of the questionnaire is included as Appendix 2 of this report.

The questionnaires were forwarded by the Committee to the Clerk in each of the area municipalities. Sufficient copies of Section 2 and the appendix were provided for distribution to each local department and each local Board, Commission, Authority, etc. which is supported in whole or in part by the municipal tax levy, and the Clerk was requested to distribute them accordingly, and upon their completion to return them to the Metropolitan Committee of Department Heads.

As the completed questionnaires were received they were sorted into four categories as follows: The first category, comprising the Section 1 questionnaires was given to the Metropolitan Clerk for summary and analysis. The second category, comprising questionnaires received from those departments, Board, etc. which have both Metropolitan and local counterparts was sorted and forwarded to the respective Metropolitan Departments for summary and analysis. The Metropolitan and City Housing Authorities were included in this category, although the former is really a Provincial agency.

The third category comprising questionnaires from local departments which have no Metropolitan counterparts was forwarded to the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board for summary and analysis.

The fourth category comprises questionnaires from Metropolitan departments which have no local counterparts. These Metropolitan departments were asked to answer certain additional questions concerning the possible effects of amalgamation.

As the various summaries were completed they were forwarded to the Committee for inclusion in this report.

The structure of the report is based upon the four categories outlined above, so that the report is in four parts. Each part has been divided into chapters, with each chapter corresponding to a departmental function. The index lists the departments included in each part; they have been arranged in alphabetical order. Each chapter consists of two sections. The first section, prepared by the Committee, deals generally with the subject of that chapter, raising certain questions pertinent to an amalgamation study. The second section consists of the summary prepared by the Metropolitan Department concerned, of the information collected by the questionnaires.

The index is a complete list of all the functions covered by this report. In general, it may be stated that the report attempts to cover all departments operating directly under Councils or Council Committees, and the majority of Boards, Commissions, Authorities, etc. which are supported in the whole or in part by the municipal tax levy. Self-supporting boards, commissions, etc. have been generally excluded, as have organizations which are generally regarded as being outside the structure of municipal government. The following list of exclusions will help make clear what the report does not cover:

A. Boards, Commissions, Authorities, etc. Supported in whole or part by the Municipal Tax Levy; but excluded for various reasons:

(1) The Metropolitan and Local Public and Separate School Boards have been excluded because they are currently the subject of a detailed study by the Metropolitan School Board.

(2) Library Boards have been excluded because they have recently been the subject of a detailed study by the special Metropolitan Library Committee.

(3) The Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority has been excluded because it would presumably be unaffected by amalgamation.

(4) Safety Councils have been excluded because only one such council returned a questionnaire.

(5) The Parking Authority of the City of Toronto has been excluded because it is regarded as self-supporting.

(6) The City of Toronto Boards of Management of Balmy Beach Park, Good Neighbours Club, Ravina Gardens, Runnymede Hospital, Ted Reeve Arena, and the University Settlement Recreation Centre, have been excluded because completed questionnaires were not received from them.

(7) The City of Toronto Civic Committees on Advisory Personnel, Civic Awards of Merit, Civic Employees' Pension committee, and Fire Department Superannuation and Benefit Fund, have been excluded because, again, completed questionnaires were not received from them.

(8) Other City of Toronto Boards, Authorities, etc. such as the Historical Board, and the Housing Authority have been included, with the exception of the Redevelopment Advisory Council from which no questionnaire was received.

B Boards, Commissions, Authorities, etc. excluded because they are generally regarded as self-supporting, specifically:

(1) Hydro and Public Utilities Commissions, except insofar as they have been included in the Works Department summary because of the role they play in water distribution.

(2) The Parking Authority of the City of Toronto.

(3) The Toronto Transit Commission.

(4) The Canadian National Exhibition Association.

C Other Boards, Commissions, etc. which are generally regarded as being outside the structure of municipal government, have been excluded, although some of them receive municipal grants. The following should be specifically noted:

(1) Industrial Commissions.

(2) The Toronto Harbour Commission (except insofar as reference is made to its lifesaving operations).

(3) The Metropolitan Toronto Convention and Visitors' Association.

(4) Children's Aid Societies.

(5) Humane Societies.

(6) The Art Gallery of Toronto.

(7) The Don Jail.

(8) The Toronto and York Roads Commission.

With the exception of these exclusions, the coverage of the survey may be regarded as quite comprehensive.

All the questionnaires received have been bound for permanent retention. They may prove a valuable source should any further studies be undertaken.

Before dealing with the departmental summaries in parts 1 to 4 of the report, Chapter 2 below attempts an overall evaluation and summary of all the important information collected.

CHAPTER 2

EVALUATION AND SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

EVALUATION

In considering this report in the light of the terms of reference, the following comments may prove helpful.

As noted in Chapter 1, a standardized questionnaire was prepared and circulated to the Metropolitan and area municipality departments and tax-supported Boards, Commissions, etc. This questionnaire covered all the items set forth in the terms of reference, excepting Item 1 (f) - population, assessment and land area data, which was supplied directly by the Assessment Department and is found in Appendix 1 to this report - and Item 4 - information on provincial grants, which is being provided separately from this report.

This report summarizes all the information supplied in the returned questionnaires, and may therefore be said to fulfil generally the requirements laid down by the terms of reference. Two deficiencies must however be noted: the first is the omission of School Boards, which were purposely excluded from the survey after it was determined that the Metropolitan Toronto School Board in its concurrent survey would be compiling all the essential information on local School Boards, stipulated in the terms of reference; the second is the omission from this report of an overall organizational chart indicating all the data specified under Items 1 and 2 of the terms of reference. The compilation of such a complex chart proved impossible within the time available because of the very large amount of information it would have to contain, the fact that much of this information was provided separately for the departments but not provided in the form of a detailed chart covering the whole of a municipality, and the fact that some of the information required was not provided. The overall summary table found later in this chapter does however, contain much of the essential information which such an overall organizational chart would have contained. Summaries of most of the remainder of the information requested will be found in the ensuing individual chapters.

With the above exceptions, it is felt that the report largely fulfils the requirements laid down in the terms of reference. It should be noted that it has been assumed the terms of reference implicitly require comments on the significant facts emerging from the survey as they relate to the question of amalgamation; such comments have been made at the beginning

of each of the following chapters. They are, of course, not intended to argue either for or against amalgamation, but are intended solely to bring into focus some of the significant points deserving the consideration of the Special Committee.

It is not the purpose of this report to provide the Special Committee with all the information necessary for a decision for or against amalgamation; the purpose, as set down in the terms of reference, is the much more limited one of providing a picture of the total existing governmental and administrative structure in the Metropolitan area. This submission supplies a considerable part of the data which would be necessary to construct a model or models of one or more amalgamated structures, with which the present structure might then be compared, in order to estimate the quantitative changes which amalgamation would probably bring. Such models could, of course, be constructed for a completely amalgamated system, for the amalgamation of one or more functions within the present federated system, for partial amalgamation along the lines of the five-city plan, or for the simple extension and expansion of inter-municipal co-operative agreements in the provision of certain services within the present administrative structure.

It will be evident however, that even if such further investigations were carried out, they would still not set forth all the information necessary on which to base a final decision. There would remain the overriding matter of the quantity and quality of the representation which the government of Metropolitan Toronto bestows on its citizens. In addition, questions of administrative organization within the Metropolitan boundaries are closely related to questions of the relationships between Metropolitan Toronto and its neighbouring municipalities. The Special Committee would still find it necessary to weigh these and many other matters, along with any more or less definite recommendations which might emerge from further investigations; and of course, such recommendations based on a comparison of hypothetical models with the present system, would themselves be subject to many qualifications and require very careful evaluation.

This is not to say that the present study is purely factual, while any further studies would be purely conjectural, for the facts collected in this survey are subject to certain qualifications, and further investigations might be expected to probe more deeply into certain factual aspects of the situation. Nevertheless the Special Committee should realize that this report represents the first essentially factual stage of study, and that further stages would deal primarily not with present facts but with future possibilities.

Although this means that the present survey is not conditional upon the many hypothetical assumptions which would have to be made to estimate future changes under amalgamation, the information in this report does require certain qualifying remarks. As with any questionnaire survey, the various respondents have evidently not all interpreted the questions in precisely the same way. For example, the question on duplication or overlapping of work performed at the Metropolitan and local levels, if given a very narrow interpretation, would lead to the conclusion that no duplication exists unless two departments are performing exactly the same work in exactly the same manner; on the other hand, given a broader interpretation, it might lead to the conclusion that overlapping exists if two departments are merely performing similar work even though they are each interested in somewhat different aspects of it.

On the whole, however, the questions seem to have been understood and the answers prepared conscientiously, the only limitations being the limited amount of time which many of the departments, under pressure of other work, were able to devote to the questionnaire, and the inability to supply certain portions of the information requested due to the fact that some departments do not keep their records in a form that would provide the answers requested. For example, many of the area municipality departments combine several functions, each of which is handled by a separate department at the Metro level, and they could not readily provide the portions of their staff and expenditures devoted to each of these functions. Again, in some cases, certain overhead costs borne generally by a municipality on behalf of all its departments may have been excluded from the returns because they are not readily available on a departmental basis. While in certain cases - notably works and roads - such difficulties necessitated further inquiries, sufficient information has been obtained to provide the required summary.

Thus while the above qualifications should be kept in mind, it is not felt on the whole that they detract seriously from the general picture provided in the following pages.

SUMMARY

The accompanying overall summary table sets forth the 1960 staff and expenditures picture, by departmental category, for Metropolitan Toronto and all the area municipalities combined. Before turning to the table, it should be noted that the non-salary expenditures were intended to exclude all capital expenditures, debenture debt payments, and any rents paid for office space; note also that the table does not include any of the expenditures re: councils and council committees etc., which are fully dealt with in Part I of this report.

The grand totals indicated on the table of approximately 19,400 staff, and approximately 133 million dollars total expenditures, are impressive. Turning to the separate parts of the table, which correspond to the parts of this report, it will be noted that nearly 95 million dollars or 72% of the grand total expenditures of 133 million dollars is due as would be expected to departments which are found at both the Metropolitan and local levels. Departments found only at the local level account for nearly $18,000,000 or roughly 13% of the grand total. Departments found only at the Metro level account for approximately 20 million dollars, being the remaining 15% of the grand total.

Only six of the departmental categories account for more than 5 million dollars total expenditures; in descending order they are:

Works -	approximately	25	million dollars.	(incl. only works functions not covered elsewhere).
Roads -	"	23	"	"
Welfare -	"	20	"	"
Police -	"	16	"	"
Fire -	"	12	"	"
Parks & Recreation	"	11	"	"

Between them these six account for over 80% of grand total expenditures. Of the six it will be noted that one (police) is already amalgamated, one other (fire) is purely local, and the other four are both local and Metro.

In terms of per capita expenditures, they range from $16.37 for Works to $0.02 for Courts of Revision, with grand total expenditures per capita of $87.01.

Of the other information collected on the questionnaires perhaps the most interesting is the degree of duplication indicated; in practically all cases where this question was answered, either no duplication or only a small amount of duplication was indicated. It should be noted in Chapters 4 to 29, that unless otherwise stated, comments by Metropolitan Department Heads on duplication, refer to duplication at the staff level only, and not to any duplication which may exist between councils, boards, etc.

TOTAL STAFF AND EXPENDITURES - METROPOLITAN TORONTO AND ALL MUNICIPALITIES COMBINED, 1960

All figures are based on the information received; estimated figures are indicated "est."

Departmental Category	Total Staff*	Total Salaries	Total Non-Salary Expenditures**	Total All Expenditures	Total Expenditures Per Capita Metro Population
		$	$	$	$
Part II					
Audit	02	409,511	169,970	579,481	0.38
Offices of Chairman and Mayor	16	79,121	20,051	99,172	0.07
Separate Clerks	163	765,151	779,370	1,544,521	1.01
Clerk-Treasurers	100	412,504	184,009	596,513	0.39
Housing Authorities	159	389,209	1,319,776****	2,009,685****	1.32
Legal	77	455,020	188,478	643,498	0.42
Parks and Recreation	est. 2,934****	est. 4,429,000	est. 6,756,000	est.11,185,000	7.33
Personnel	49	248,477	59,477	307,954	0.20
Planning and Committees of Adjustment	161	827,356	309,921	1,137,277	0.75
Property	568	1,930,142	1,119,166	3,049,308	2.00
Roads	1,422	7,289,597	16,093,074	23,382,671	15.29
Traffic Engineering	189	673,865	1,676,043	2,349,908	1.54
Separate Treasurers	481	2,119,335	535,466	2,654,801	1.74
Welfare	1,434	4,013,482	15,564,209	19,577,691	13.34
Works***	est. 4,200	est.16,000,000	est. 9,000,000	est.25,000,000	16.37
Total Part II	12,055	41,122,470	53,775,010	94,897,480	62.15
Part III					
Buildings	256	1,224,774	233,510	1,458,284	0.96
Fire	2,146	9,825,100	1,839,226	11,664,326	7.63
Health	951***	3,517,330	781,978	4,299,308	2.32
Other (excl. lifesaving)	78	323,367	76,453	399,820	0.26
Total Part III	3,431	14,890,571	2,931,167	17,821,738	11.67
Part IV					
Assessment	424	1,647,740	245,429	1,893,169	1.24
Civil Defence	23	114,132	49,797	163,929	0.11
Courts of Revision	2	18,733	12,734	31,467	0.02
Juvenile and Family Court	101	436,301	72,300	508,601	0.33
Licensing Commission	68	238,100	86,655	324,755	0.21
Magistrates' Court	176	855,972	259,444	1,115,416	0.73
Police Commission	3,133	13,307,757	2,796,909	16,104,666	10.55
Total Part IV	3,927	16,618,735	3,523,268	20,142,003	13.19
Grand Totals	19,393	72,631,776	60,229,445	132,061,221	87.01

* Permanent and Temporary Staff

** Excluding Capital Expenditures, Debt Charges and Office Rents

*** Includes only Works Functions not covered elsewhere, i.e. under Parks, Roads, Traffic and Buildings

**** Including a considerable number of part-time employees

***** Including municipal taxes levied on housing projects operated by the Housing Authorities

PART I

SECTION I OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

PART ONE

SECTION I OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

CHAPTER 3

INFORMATION COLLECTED ON THE STRUCTURE OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS

COMMENTS ON THE INFORMATION COLLECTED

Before turning to the summary of the Section I questionnaires in the second section of this chapter, the following points may be noted.

Perhaps the most notable point emerging from this summary is the size of the total governmental structure in the Metropolitan Toronto area. The fourteen councils with a total of 109 individuals comprising their membership constitute an impressive example of representative Government. But it is in the council committees that a great deal of the real work of government is carried on, and here the total of 94 committees with a combined membership of 444 is convincing evidence of the magnitude of the governmental task in the Metropolitan area.

It is of course, likely that under amalgamation the total number of elected representatives may be reduced and the question which then arises is how the very large amount of work now performed by fourteen councils and their 94 committees could be handled by considerably fewer council members. While the total work load might be somewhat decreased - for example, by a reduction in the total number of departments from the present 124 down to probably 20 to 30, - nevertheless the work load would still remain extremely heavy.

It is apparent that more than a simple question of decision-making efficiency is involved; a single council of moderate size might well seem more efficient in reaching its decisions than the present two-level system. But if it were unable to maintain the relatively close contact with the citizens which now exists, would it be more likely to reach wrong decisions or decisions which at least ignore the interests of important minorities?

If the number of councils, council committees, and departments were reduced under amalgamation, then it might be reasonable to assume that the number of local boards, commissions, authorities, etc. which currently total over 100, might also be reduced. Their workload under amalgamation remains to be determined, but it would probably still be very heavy.

If the magnitude and profusion of the present governmental structure is impressive, not less impressive is the relatively small cost to the taxpayers for these decision-making bodies. Less than half a million dollars was paid in 1960 in the form of all salaries and allowances paid to all members of councils in Metropolitan Toronto which is small considering the size of the governmental structure they are responsible for and the hundreds of millions of dollars of annual expenditure they control. Under amalgamation, a smaller number of councillors, each of whom would undoubtedly bear a very heavy workload, would presumably require considerable higher average remuneration; the total remuneration paid might still be less than the present total, of course, because of their reduction in number. As noted in the following summary, one of the problems members of an amalgamated council would face would be the difficulty of finding the time required to study the anticipated lengthy agendas which would come before the council and its committees and to acquaint themselves with details of the numerous varying and complex local problems in all the different sections of the area. To meet these difficulties would evidently be a full-time job, and it is at least questionable whether even full-time councillors could become as familiar with local problems as are the present local councillors.

If the picture of the present municipal structure is therefore a complex one with a large number of councils, council committees and councillors generally receiving a modest remuneration for the work they perform, the picture of an amalgamated structure which tentatively may be suggested would involve a single council, fewer council committees, and a smaller number of councillors receiving higher average remuneration for duties which would almost certainly require their full-time devotion.

The Metropolitan Clerk's summary of the Section I questionnaires received, follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO CLERK'S DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON THE STRUCTURE OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS

Question 1:

Names of Municipalities Covered in this Summary

Township of East York
Township of Etobicoke
Village of Forest Hill
Town of Leaside
Village of Long Branch
Town of Mimico
Town of New Toronto
Township of North York
Township of Scarborough
Village of Swansea
City of Toronto
Town of Weston
Township of York
(Total: 13)
and
The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto

Question 2:

(A) Summary of Structures of the Councils of the 13 Area Municipalities Combined in 1960

Office	Number	How Elected: At Large	How Elected: By Wards
Mayors.....	5	5	
Reeves.....	8	8	
Controllers.....	4	4	
Deputy Reeves.....	9	5	4
Aldermen.....	18	-	18
Councillors.....	64	38	26
Totals.....	108	60	48

(B) Structure of 1960 Metropolitan Council

Office	Number	How Elected
Chairman of Council.....	1	By Members of Metropolitan Council.
Councillors.....	24	The Metropolitan Council is elected in accordance with Section 5 (1) of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953, (Chapter 260, R.S.O. 1960) and is composed of:
	25	
	-	

(a) The head of the Council of each area municipality.
(b) The two members of the Board of Control of City of Toronto who at last municipal election received the highest number of votes.

Question 2:
(B) (cont'd)

(c) The Alderman in each ward of the City of Toronto who at the last municipal election received the highest number of votes in such ward.

Question 3 (a):
(A) Committees of the Councils of Area Municipalities in 1960.

Name of Committee	Total No. of Committees	Total No. of Members
Administrative Advisory	1	5
Board of Control	1	5
Buildings	2	10
Buildings and Development	1	10
Buildings, Property and Welfare	1	3
Buildings, Welfare, Property and License	1	5
Civil Defence	1	3
Committee of General Purposes	1	9
Education	1	5
Executive	2	7
Finance	6	25
Finance, Office, Administration, Legal, Legislation and Industrial	1	3
Finance - Personnel	1	3
Finance - Public Utilities	1	3
Fire	6	21
Fire and Parks	1	3
Fire and Water Works	1	5
Fire and Utilities	1	3
General	1	4
Historical	1	9
Hydro	2	14
Industrial	1	4
Industrial and Commercial	1	4
Industrial, Insurance, Pension and Welfare	1	3
Legislation and Reception	1	4
Parks and/or Recreation	8	33
Parks and Exhibitions	1	10
Parks and Rinks	1	5
Pension Liaison	1	2
Personnel Negotiations	1	5
Personnel - Employee Relations	2	6
Property	5	17
Property and Planning	1	3
Public Relations	1	5
Public Safety	1	5
Recognition	1	3
Special Events	1	5
Special Housing	1	5
Traffic and/or Parking	6	23
Traffic, Parking, Police, Civil Defence	1	3
Traffic, Legislation and Welfare	1	3

Question 3 (a):

(A) (cont'd)

Traffic, Fire and Licensing	1	4
Welfare	1	5
Welfare, Fire and Legislation	1	10
Works	8	34
Works (Capital)	1	5
Works (Maintenance)	1	5
Works (Roads)	1	5
Works, Roads and Sanitation	1	3
Works - Water	1	5
Total	87	380

(B) Committees of Metropolitan Council in 1960

Name of Committee	Number	No. of Members
Executive Committee	1	7
Parks and Recreation	1	7
Roads and Traffic	1	7
Welfare and Housing	1	7
Works	1	7
Special Grants	1	7
Special Court House	1	13
Special Library	1	9
Total	7	64

Question 3 (b):

(A) Departments operating directly under Council or Council Committees of Area Municipalities in 1960.

Name of Department	Number
Animal Control	1
Audit	1
Building	2
Building Maintenance	1
Building Permits	1
Building and Development	1
Building and Plumbing	1
By-law Enforcement	1
Clerk's	6
Clerk-Treasurer's	7
Engineering	2
Fire	13
Health	13
Industrial	2
Legal	3
Parks and/or Recreation:	
Parks	3
Recreation	3
Parks and Recreation	7
Personnel	4
Personnel and Public Relations	1
Property	4
Purchasing and Stores	1
Real Estate	1
Roads and Garbage	1

Question 3(b):
(A) (cont'd)

Roads and Traffic	1
Roads and Works	1
Traffic	1
Treasurer's	6
Welfare	10
Works	11
Total	110

(B) Departments operating directly under the Metropolitan Council or Metropolitan Committees in 1960

Name of Department	Number
Assessment	1
Audit	1
Clerk's	1
Courts of Revision	1
Legal	1
Magistrate's Court	1
Parks	1
Personnel	1
Property	1
Roads	1
Traffic Engineering	1
Treasury	1
Welfare	1
Works	1
Total	14

Question 3 (c):
(A) Local Boards, Commissions, Authorities, etc. of Area Municipalities, which were supported in whole or part by the local municipal tax levy in 1960.

Name of Board, Commission, Authority etc.	Total No. of Boards etc.	Total No. of Members
Boards of Education	11	109
Boards of Health	13	66
Committees of Adjustment	4	17
Community Centre Boards	4	19
East York Arena Board	1	7
East York-Kiwanis Swimming Pool Board	1	3
Etobicoke Swimming Pool Board	1	7
Housing Company	1	7
Incinerator Boards	2	7
Leaside Memorial Community Gardens	1	7
Library Boards	13	80
Norman McEachern Community Centre Board	1	7
North York Memorial Community Hall Board	1	7

Question 3 (c):
(A) (cont'd)

Parking Authorities.....	2	6
Planning Boards.....	8	65
Recreation and/or Parks Commissions.....	8	67
Safety Councils.....	3	44
Toronto, City of:		
Boards of Management:		
Balmy Beach Park.....	1	6
Good Neighbours Club.....	1	7
Ravina Gardens.....	1	7
Runnymede Hospital.....	1	20
Ted Reeve Arena.....	1	7
University Settlement Recreation Centre..	1	7
Civic Committees:		
Advisory Personnel.....	1	7
Civic Awards of Merit.....	1	7
Civic Employees Pension Committee.....	1	5
Fire Department Superannuation and Benefit Fund.....	1	7
Other:		
Historical Board.....	1	17
Housing Authority.....	1	5
Limited Dividend Housing Corporation , Limited.....	1	5
Redevelopment Advisory Council.....	1	15
Total.....	90	654

(Note: In addition to the foregoing list of Committees and Boards appointed by the Toronto City Council the City also submitted the following list, viz):

Boards, Commissions, Associations, etc. showing number of City Council appointees thereon:

Name	Number
Art Gallery of Toronto.....	5
Canadian Red Cross Society (Toronto Branch) Executive Committee.....	2
Canadian National Exhibition Association:	
Board of Directors.....	9
Executive and Finance Committee.....	3
Health League of Canada.....	2
Lake Ontario Anti-Pollution Association.....	2
Toronto Recreation Committee.....	9
Board of Directors:	
Laughlen Lodge.....	2
North Toronto Community Corporation.....	3
Our Lady of Mercy Hospital.....	1
Toronto Humane Society.....	1
Boards of Governors:	
New Mount Sinai Hospital.....	2
St. Joseph's Hospital.....	1
St. Michael's Hospital.....	2
Toronto East General Hospital.....	2
Toronto Western Hospital.....	2
Women's College Hospital.....	1

(cont'd)

Board of Management:	
Woodgreen Community Centre.....	3
Board of Trustees:	
Toronto General Hospital.....	5
Total.....	57

Note: Toronto Public Library Board was shown in list immediately above but is included with Library Boards of other Area Municipalities shown on previous page.

(B) Metropolitan Boards, Commissions, Authorities, etc. which were supported in whole or part by the Metropolitan levy in 1960.

Name of Board, Commission, Authority, etc.	Number of Boards etc.	Number of Members.
Metropolitan Board of Commissioners of Police..	1	5
Metropolitan Licensing Commission.....	1	3
Metropolitan School Board.....	1	22
Metropolitan Separate School Board.....	1	16
Metropolitan Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.....	1	53
Metropolitan Toronto Civil Defence Committee...	1	7
Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company, Limited..	1	7
Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board.....	1	24
Metropolitan Toronto Police Benefit Fund Committee.....	1	9
Retirement Committee of Metropolitan Toronto Pension Plan.....	1	6
Riverdale Hospital, Board of Directors.....	1	10
Toronto Transit Commission.....	1	5
Total.....	12	167

(Note: Statutory and other grants are made to the following, but they are not regarded as part of the Metropolitan Corporation structure:

Metropolitan Toronto Industrial Commission
Metropolitan Toronto Convention and Visitors Association
Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto
Catholic Children's Aid Society of Metropolitan Toronto.)

Question 4:
(A) Total 1960 Salaries and Allowances Paid to Members of Councils of the 13 Area Municipalities Combined

Office	Paid by the Municipality: Council Duties	Paid by the Municipality: Committee Duties	Paid by the Municipality: Total	Paid by Local Boards etc.	Total
Mayors (5)	$ 24,700.00	--	$ 24,700.00	$ 1,200.00	$ 25,900.00
Reeves (8)	43,900.00	--	43,900.00	6,852.00	50,752.00
Controllers (4)	34,000.00	--	34,000.00	--	34,000.00
Deputy Reeves (9)	20,845.00	860.00	21,705.00	1,822.00	23,527.00
Aldermen (18)	72.000.00	1,000.00	73.000.00	--	73.000.00
Councillors (64)	120.385.00	10.159.00	130,544.00	6,277.00	136,821.00
	$315,830.00	$12,019.00	$327,849.00	$16,151.00	$344,000.00

(B) Total 1960 Salaries and Allowances Paid to Members of the Metropolitan Council

Office	Paid by Metropolitan Corporation Council Duties	Committee Duties	Total	Paid by Local Boards etc.	Total
Chairman (1)	$15,000.00	$ 2,000.00	$17,000.00	$ 8,000.00	$25,000.00
Mayor of Toronto (1)	1,800.00	2,000.00	3,800.00	5,000.00	8,800.00
Other Members of Executive Comm. (5)	9,000.00	10,000.00	19,000.00		19,000.00
Other Council Members (18)	32,400.00	400.00	32,800.00		32,800.00
	$58,200.00	$14,400.00	$72,600.00	$13,000.00	$85,600.00

Question 5:

(A) 1960 Current Expenditures of 13 Area Municipalities Combined for any services performed directly for the Council or any of its Committees by private firms or organizations outside the municipal structure

Description of Services	Expenditures
Consultants' services.....	$ 38,456.00
History of Municipality.....	$ 6,436.00
Total.....	$ 44,892.00

(Note: For Audit and Legal Services performed for municipalities by private firms, see summaries submitted by Metropolitan Audit and Legal Departments)

(B)

1960 Current Expenditures for any services performed directly for the Metropolitan Council or any of its Committees by private firms or organizations outside the Municipal structure.

T.T.C. Judicial Enquiry.....$ 8,300.00

COMMENTS
REQUESTED FROM METROPOLITAN CLERK
RESPECTING PROBABLE CHANGES IN MUNICIPAL STRUCTURE UNDER FULL AMALGAMATION OF AREA MUNICIPALITIES INTO A SINGLE MUNICIPALITY

STRUCTURE:

It total amalgamation became effective, it is assumed that there would be a single Council with a membership less than the present aggregate membership of municipal Councils in the Metropolitan Toronto area.

If is also assumed that the number of Committees, Departments and Boards, Commissions, Authorities, etc., would be reduced by the process of consolidation with each consolidated body taking on an increased workload necessitated by having jurisdiction over the entire Metropolitan Toronto area.

EFFICIENCY POTENTIAL:

With respect to the efficiency of a single municipal organization as compared with the present number, it may be contended that centralization of authority would reduce the number of steps now required in some of the administrative processes. For example, the issue of debentures would only require the approval of one Council. It may be argued that some duplication of time and effort would be saved if problems having area-wide application were considered by one municipal body instead of several as at present.

On the other hand, certain practical difficulties may arise in connection with the processing of a multitude of items by one Council. For example, it would likely be necessary to hold numerous and/or protracted Council meetings to cope with the combined workload that is presently being handled by 13 Area Councils and the Metropolitan Council.

Under the existing municipal structure, deputations are heard by the Councils or Committees of Area Municipalities and the Metropolitan Corporation on matters of local or area-wide interest. Under a single form of municipal government, it would appear to be necessary for the Council or its Committees to hear deputations from the entire area which could be tremendously time-consuming.

In addition, it may be difficult for some members of Council to find the required time to study the anticipated lengthy agendas that would come before the Council and its Committees, and to acquaint themselves with details of the numerous, varying and possibly complex local problems in all the different sections of this large Metropolitan Toronto area.

PART II

DEPARTMENTS HAVING METROPOLITAN AND LOCAL COUNTERPARTS

PART TWO
DEPARTMENTS HAVING METROPOLITAN AND LOCAL COUNTERPARTS

CHAPTER 4
AUDIT

Perhaps the most notable point to emerge from the following summary of information collected on auditing, is the fact that the City of Toronto is the only area municipality having an Audit Department comparable to the Metropolitan Audit Department. In the other twelve municipalities outside auditors perform all audit functions. As would be expected there is some variation among these twelve municipalities in the types of auditing which these outside auditors are required to do. In most cases pre-payment audits are not done, but there are several exceptions. Again, in the majority of cases, detailed rather than test audits are performed but again there are several exceptions.

In considering the possible effects of amalgamation, it is obvious that auditing procedures would be standardized and while this would be expected to increase the auditing workload, the total number of accounts requiring auditing would probably be considerably reduced, so that the total workload might well be less than at present, with a somewhat more comprehensive auditing procedure overall.

It is also very likely that under amalgamation all auditing would be performed by the Municipal Audit Department. It seems probable that this would result in some savings in regard to the work now performed by the outside auditing firms whose charges presumably include profits for the firms.

The Metropolitan Auditor's summary of information collected on auditing in the Metropolitan area follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO AUDIT DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON AUDITING

The City of Toronto is the only municipality which has an Audit Department comparable to the Metropolitan Audit Department. In order to give a comprehensive picture of auditing, the following summary of the replies given by the area municipalities to six questions on auditing is followed by detailed statements on the Metropolitan and City Audit Departments.

I Area Municipalities' replies to questions on auditing

1. "List organizations, including all local boards, commissions, etc., for which the books and accounts are audited by your outside auditors."

2. "For the above organizations, list those for whom:
   (a) a prepayment audit is done;
   (b) a complete detailed audit is done;
   (c) a test audit is done."

East York	Prepayment Audit	Detailed or Test Audit
The Township	No	Detailed
The Hydro-Electric Commission	"	"
The Board of Education	"	"
The Library Board	"	"
The Recreation Council	"	"
The Memorial Arena Board	"	"
The Kiwanis Memorial Swimming Pool	"	"
The East York-Leaside Health Unit	"	"
Etobicoke		
The Township	Yes	Detailed
The Library Board	No	"
The Parks Board	"	"
The Hydro-Electric Commission	"	"
The Board of Education	"	"
The Union Separate School Board	"	"
The Police Village of Thistletown	"	"
The Planning Board	"	"
The Board of Health	"	"
Forest Hill		
The Village	No	Detailed
The Hydro-Electric Commission	"	"
The Waterworks System	"	"
The Recreation Committee	"	"
The Board of Education	"	"
The Library Board	"	"
Leaside		
The Town	No	Test
The Board of Education	"	Detailed
The Library Board	"	Test
The Memorial Community Gardens	"	Detailed

	Prepayment Audit	Detailed or Test Audit
Long Branch		
The Village	No	Detailed
The Hydro-Electric Commission	"	"
The Waterworks System	"	"
The Library Board	"	"
Mimico		
The Town	No	Test
The Library Board	"	Detailed
The Recreation Commission	"	"
The Pension Fund	"	"
New Toronto		
The Town	No	Detailed
The Library Board	"	"
The Public Utilities Commission	"	"
North York		
The Township	No	Detailed
The Board of Education	"	"
The Hydro-Electric Commission	"	"
The Library Board	"	"
Scarborough		
The Township	No	Test
The Recreation and Parks Commission	"	"
The Library Board	"	"
The Board of Health	"	"
The Planning Board	"	"
The Board of Education	"	"
The Public Utilities Commission	"	"
Swansea		
The Village	No	Detailed
The Board of Education	"	"
The Board of Health	"	"
The Library Board	"	"
The Community Centre Board	"	"
Toronto		
The City	Yes	Detailed
The Hydro-Electric Commission	No	"
The Board of Education	"	"
The Canadian National Exhibition Association	"	"
The Toronto Harbour Commission	"	"
The Library Board	"	"
The Runnymede Hospital	"	"
The Royal Agricultural Winter Fair	"	"
The Housing Authority	"	"
The Parking Authority	"	"
The Historical Board	"	"
The Balmy Beach Park Commissioners	"	"
The North Toronto Community Corporation	"	"

	Prepayment Audit	Detailed or Test Audit
Toronto (cont'd)		
The Ted Reeve Arena Board	No	Detailed
The Ravina Gardens Board	"	"
The Planning Board	"	"
The Municipal Abattoir (sold Oct.1,1960)	"	"
The Limited Dividend Housing Corporation	"	"
The Fire Department Superannuation & Benefit Fund	Yes	"
The Civic Employees' Pension and Benefit Fund	"	"
The University Settlement Board	No	"
The Committee of Adjustment re Zoning by-law	"	"
The Casa Loma and Casa Loma Trust Fund operated by the Kiwanis Club	"	"
Various charitable organizations for verifying rates per day and deficits	"	"
National Soccer League for verifying percentage of gate receipts paid as rental	"	"
The Grenadier Restaurant Limited for verifying percentage of revenue paid as rental	"	"
The Hydro-Electric System Employees' Charitable and Welfare Fund, at the request of the Commissioners	"	"
Various business re damages for business disturbances for land expropriated	"	"
Weston		
The Town	No	Detailed
The Library Board	"	"
The Board of Education	"	"
The Public Utilities Commission	"	"
York		
The Township	Yes	Detailed
The Employees' Pension and Benefit Fund	No	"
The Community Centres Boards	"	"
The Housing Company Limited	"	"
The Planning Board	"	"
The Hydro-Electric Commission	Yes	"
The Board of Education	"	"
The Parking Authority	No	"
The Library Board	"	"
The Waterworks System	Yes	"

3. "For the years 1952 to 1960 inclusive, list special reports requested of the outside auditors."

East York - None

Etobicoke - None

Forest Hill - None

Leaside - None

Long Branch - 1957 - "Special study with regard to the transfer of funds from Pension Fund to Metro Police Pension Fund".

Mimico - 1953 - "Re proposed pension plan."
1954 - "Re Metropolitan Toronto Transition."
1959 - "Re Police Pension Plan."

New Toronto - None

North York - None

Scarborough - 1960 - "Survey of engineering department establishment functions and workloads."
- "Survey of building department establishment functions and workloads."

Swansea - 1953 - "Debenture reports re Metro".
1956 - "Report re amalgamation brief."
1957 - "Revision of accounting system."

Toronto - Not answered.

Weston - None

York - 1955 - "Re schedules of debentures assumed by Metropolitan Toronto."
1960 - "Re special report in connection with investigation of Township affairs."

4. "For the years 1952 to 1960 inclusive, list the total amounts paid to the outside auditors for all services rendered to your municipality and all local boards, commissions etc."

	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	Total
East York	$ 6,600.00	$ 6,600.00	$ 6,600.00	$ 6,600.00	$ 6,600.00	$ 8,500.00	$ 8,500.00	$ 8,500.00	$ 8.500.00	$ 67,000.00
Etobicoke	10,200.00	10,500.00	11,200.00	11,450.00	12,000.00	12,500.00	12,900.00	13,500.00	14,000.00	108,250.00
Forest Hill	5,475.00	8,106.25	7,093.75	7,093.75	7,093.75	9,937.50	9,100.00	9,100.00	9,100.00	72,100.00
Leaside	3,325.00	3,615.00	2,885.00	3,135.00	4,709.39	3,910.00	3,560.00	3,655.00	5,080.00	33,874.39
Long Branch *	2,724.80	2,500.50	2,205.78	2,039.00	3,565.15	4,498.57	4,074.59	4,235.92	4,179.65	30,023.96
Mimico *	2,190.00	3,062.50	2,758.47	2,124.00	2,320.44	2,736.64	2,687.60	3,403.10	2,948.53	24,231.28
New Toronto *	3,650.20	4,316.00	4,488.75	4,429.00	4,772.41	4,743.79	4,642.81	5,098.98	5,834.82	41,976.76
North York	7,500.00	8.800.00	11,500.00	12,700.00	15,700.00	18,250.00	19,250.00	23,000.00	25,150.00	141,850.00
Scarborough	7,100.00	11,850.00	12,650.00	13,800.00	16,050.00	15,500.00	15,705.84	16,900.60	18,100.00	127,656.44
Swansea	1,300.00	1,460.00	1,300.00	1,625.00	2,237.00	2,365.00	2,100.00	2,100.00	2,400.00	16,887.00
Toronto ** ***	224,729.00	228,669.00	223,897.00	230,874.00	217,725.00	220,429.00	223,638.00	240,001.00	262,009.14	2,071,971.14
Weston	1,850.00	1,850.00	2,050.00	1,850.00	1,850.00	2,800.00	2,800.00	2,800.00	2,800.00	20,650.00
York	12,000.00	12,000.00	13,500.00	15,430.50	15,500.00	15,500.00	15,500.00	18,000.00	18,750.00	136,180.50
Total Area Municipalities	$288,644.00	$303,329.25	$302,128.75	$313,150.25	$310,123.14	$321,670.50	$324,458.84	$350,294.60	$378,852.14	$2,892,651.47
Metropolitan Toronto ***	-	-	75,677.88	104,345.27	116,153.43	151,888.78	173,612.46	195,288.56	200,628.70	1,017,595.08
GRAND TOTAL	$288,644.00	$303,329.25	$377,806.63	$417,495.52	$426,276.57	$473,559.28	$498,071.30	$545,583.16	$579,480.84	$3,910,246.55

* Includes audit costs paid by the Lakeshore Board of Education, allocated on the basis of public school assessment used for levy purposes.

** Information for expenses other than salaries and wages not requested except for 1960. Amounts for prior years taken from City's Estimates where actual expenditure is shown, but are exclusive of amounts paid by Treasury Department for Audit Department costs re pensions, unemployment insurance and hospital contributions.

*** City of Toronto and Metropolitan Toronto figures not reduced by amount of audit fees charged to other bodies.

5. "Please prepare a separate answer to question 11, Section II of the Questionnaire, indicating any overlapping of the services of your outside auditors with other auditing at the Metropolitan or Area Municipality levels".

East York - None.

Etobicoke - None.

Forest Hill - None.

Leaside - Unanswered.

Long Branch - None.

Mimico - Unanswered.

New Toronto - "None. Any overlapping is done by Metro Auditors not the Municipality."

North York - None.

Scarborough - None.

Swansea - None.

Toronto - Unanswered.

Weston - Unanswered.

York - None.

6. "If your municipality has an internal audit staff, please have your internal auditor complete and return a separate copy of Section II of the Questionnaire."

East York - None.

Etobicoke - None.

Forest Hill - None.

Leaside - None.

Long Branch - None.

Mimico - None.

New Toronto - None.

North York - None.

Scarborough - None.

Swansea - None.

Toronto - None.

Weston - None.

York - None.

II. Metropolitan Toronto Audit Department.

1. Statement to show for the years 1954 to 1960 inclusive the number of employees of the Metropolitan Audit Department at December 31, the annual salary and wage cost therefor, and explanation of the changes in number of employees.

Year	Number of Employees as at December 31				Salary Expenditure
	Authorized Establishment	Permanent Employees	Casual Employees	Total	
1954	16	16	2	18	$ 59,258.64
1955	19	18		18	85,679.04
1956	29	25		25	100,226.96
1957	31	29		29	133,114.84
1958	31	31	3	34	152,334.25
1959	31	30		30	167,272.40
1960	34	34	1	35	171,408.59

Reasons for Increased Staff

1. As a result of the Metropolitan Corporation becoming responsible for the following additional services under subsequent legislation:

   (a) 1955 Legislation

      1. Civil Defence
      2. Smoke Abatement
      3. Two Registry Offices and Land Titles Office
      4. Right to issue Sinking Fund debentures and the creation of the Sinking Fund Committee.

   (b) 1956 Legislation

      1. Board of Commissioners of Police and the Police Department
      2. Police Benefit Fund
      3. Licensing Commission
      4. All property rights at Toronto Island, other than the airport.
      5. Industrial waste dumping
      6. Riverdale Hospital
      7. Magistrates' Courts

   (c) 1957 Legislation

      1. Responsibility for payments under The Coroners Act.

   (d) 1958 Legislation

      1. Sharing of costs of Bloor-Danforth-University rapid transit with the Toronto Transit Commission.

   (e) 1959 Legislation

      1. Sharing of cost of Malton Road with the County of Peel.

2. Increased volume of vouchers and paysheets from all departments as each increased in size.

3. Increased volume of debenture coupons presented for redemption.

4. Increased volume of Pension Plan transactions owing to the admittance into membership of employees of Metropolitan Toronto local boards, area municipalities and local boards of area municipalities. As at December 31, 1960, there were 18 organizations whose employees were members of the Pension Plan, exclusive of those of the Metropolitan Corporation and the Metropolitan Waterworks System.

2. Statement to show the Function of the Metropolitan Audit Department

The function of the Metropolitan Audit Department is to carry out the duties imposed upon the Metropolitan Auditor by:

1. The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, R.S.O. 1960:
   - (a) Subsection 1 of Section 22
   - (b) Subsection 4 of Section 22
   - (c) Subsection 4 of Section 232
2. The Municipal Act, R.S.O. 1960:
   - (a) Subsection 4 of Section 234
   - (b) Subsection 6 of Section 236
3. Section 3 of By-law 1089 of the Metro Council

The above-noted subsections of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act are as follows:

(a) Section 22 (1):

"The Metropolitan Council shall by by-law appoint one or more auditors who shall be persons licensed by the Department (of Municipal Affairs) as municipal auditors and who shall hold office during good behaviour and be removable for cause upon the vote of two-thirds of the members of the Metropolitan Council, and the auditor or auditors so appointed shall audit the accounts and transactions of the Metropolitan Corporation."

(b) Section 22 (4):

"An auditor shall perform such duties as are prescribed by the Department (of Municipal Affairs), and also such duties as may be required by the Metropolitan Council or any local board of the Metropolitan Corporation that do not conflict with the duties prescribed by the Department."

(c) Section 232 (4):

"The auditor in his annual report shall report on the activities and position of each reserve fund established under subsection 1."

The above-noted subsections of The Municipal Act are as follows:

(a) Section 234 (4) - (concerning surety bonds of the officers of the corporation):

"The Council shall forthwith after the production thereof direct where and with whom the bonds, policies, and guarantee contracts given under this section shall be deposited for safe keeping and where the same shall be available for inspection by the auditor, and the auditor shall in his annual report to the Department (of Municipal Affairs) include such information with respect to the same as may be required by the Department."

(b) Section 236 (6) - (concerning oaths and declarations):

"Every auditor, before entering upon his duties, shall make and subscribe a declaration (Form 23)."

The above-noted Section 3 of By-law 1089 of the Metropolitan Council is as follows:

"3.(1) That in addition to all duties imposed on the Auditor by The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, 1953, and any other Statute and any By-law of the said Council, the Auditor shall have full charge and control of and be fully responsible for the due and proper conduct of the Audit Department of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, shall not allow any Department of the Municipality to overdraw its appropriation, and shall see that each item of expenditure is charged only to the proper appropriation or subdivision of appropriation and that no illegal expenditures are made of the funds of the Municipality;

(2) That notwithstanding the provisions of By-law No. 193 all accounts and paysheets of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto shall be examined and audited by the Auditor before payment thereof and that no such account or paysheet shall be paid by the Treasurer and Commissioner of Finance of the Municipality until the Auditor has certified that the same has passed through the stages required by the By-laws of the Municipality and may be legally paid by the Municipality;

(3) That all cheques issued by the said Treasurer on the bank accounts of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto shall be countersigned by the Auditor or by the Deputy Auditor for the Municipality or at the discretion of the Auditor or in the absence of both the Auditor and the Deputy Auditor by Arthur W. Varcoe, Supervisor of Audits, in charge of prepayment auditing."

Under Section 229 of The Municipal Act, the Department of Municipal Affairs has prescribed "Duties and Instructions for Municipal Auditors", and a summary of these, exclusive of normal auditing instructions, insofar as they apply to the Metropolitan Auditor, is as follows:

1. File with the Department of Municipal Affairs a copy of each audit report, drawn upon forms prescribed by the Department.

2. Audit must cover not only financial transactions of the corporation as carried on by or under the authority of the municipal council, but also accounts and financial transactions of all local boards and commissions. The fact that any of the local boards has itself appointed an auditor or that its accounts are subject to governmental or other audit does not relieve or excuse the municipal auditor from performance of his statutory duties.

3. Verify title to all property acquired.

4. Examine surety bonds.

5. Examine all by-laws, minutes, budgets, etc.

6. Report in writing every defalcation, fraud or similar irregularity upon discovery to the head of the council and to the Department of Municipal Affairs.

7. Examine and report upon all insurance.

In accordance with the above described statutory duties, the Metropolitan Auditor audits the books and accounts of the following organizations:

1. The Metropolitan Corporation
2. The Metropolitan Toronto Waterworks System
3. The Metropolitan Toronto Sinking Fund Committee
4. The Metropolitan Toronto Pension Fund
5. The Metropolitan Toronto Police Benefit Fund
6. The Metropolitan School Board

7. The Metropolitan Civil Defence Organization
8. The Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board
9. The Metropolitan Toronto Board of Commissioners of Police for the Metropolitan Corporation
10. The Metropolitan Toronto Licensing Commission
11. The Toronto Transit Commission
12. Gray Coach Lines, Limited
13. The Metropolitan Toronto Homes for the Aged
14. The Riverdale Hospital

An examination is made of the books and accounts of the following organizations in order to ascertain the correctness of the Metropolitan Corporation's share of expenditure or revenue:

1. The Toronto and York Roads Commission
2. The County of Peel re Malton Road
3. The Registry Office for the Registry Division of the City of Toronto
4. The Registry Office for the East and West Riding of the County of York
5. The Land Titles Office in the City of Toronto
6. The Metropolitan Toronto Juvenile and Family Court

In addition, the Metropolitan Auditor is the auditor for the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company, Limited, which provides a metropolitan function but which, legally, is not a local board of the Metropolitan Corporation.

3. Statement to show the Work Load (or Volume of Work) of the Metropolitan Audit Department for the year 1960

Work Load

There are 34 employees on the permanent establishment of the Metropolitan Audit Department, made up of an Auditor, Deputy Auditor, Supervisor of Audits, two clerk stenographers and twenty-nine audit clerks. During July and August one temporary employee is engaged to assist with the prepayment audit during the vacation period and casual employees are used sometimes during the latter part of December.

The work load of the Department is allocated as follows:

1. (a) Prepayment audit of vouchers and payrolls of the following organizations to ascertain their arithmetical accuracy, that they comply with the Statutes, Orders of the Ontario Municipal Board, the by-laws of the Corporation, the Minutes of the Corporation, or undernoted Organizations, the decisions of the Executive Committee, that they are in agreement with contracts, if any, that funds have been provided therefor either by the annual estimates, by subsequent transfer of funds authorized by the Council, or by the money by-laws, that they may legally be paid and that they have passed through the various stages required by the Procedure By-law of the Corporation; and the countersigning of all cheques and bank transfers for banks under the control of the Metropolitan Treasurer, the Treasurer of the Metropolitan Toronto Pension Fund, and the Treasurer of the Metropolitan Police Benefit Fund.

		The Metropolitan Corporation The Metropolitan Waterworks System The Metropolitan Toronto Licensing Commission The Metropolitan Toronto Board of Commissioners of Police for the Metropolitan Corporation The Metropolitan Toronto Homes for the Aged The Riverdale Hospital The Metropolitan Toronto Juvenile and Family Court The Metropolitan Toronto Pension Fund The Metropolitan Toronto Police Benefit Fund	Supervisor of Audits and nine Audit Clerks
	(b)	Post-payment audit of the Metropolitan Toronto Pension Fund and the Metropolitan Toronto Police Benefit Fund and preparation of the annual audit reports.	
	(c)	Payroll banks reconciliations.	
	(d)	Audit Department personnel records.	
	(e)	Audit Department appropriations and office procedure.	
2.	(a)	Prepayment and post-payment audit of the Metropolitan Corporation Treasury Department accounts, including debenture debt division and pay office division.	Deputy Auditor and 5 Audit Clerks
	(b)	Verification of the Metropolitan Corporation Balance Sheet and other financial statements, and preparation of the annual report.	
	(c)	Post-payment audit of the Metropolitan Toronto Sinking Fund Committee and preparation of the annual report.	
3.	(a)	Post-payment audit of the Metropolitan School Board and preparation of the annual report.	2 Audit Clerks
	(b)	Post-payment audit of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board and preparation of the annual report.	
4.	(a)	Post-payment audit of the Metropolitan Toronto Corporation Welfare and Housing Department.	3 Audit Clerks
	(b)	Post-payment audit of the Metropolitan Toronto Homes for The Aged and preparation of the financial report to the Provincial Department of Welfare.	
	(c)	Post-payment audit of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company, Limited and preparation of the annual report.	
5.	(a)	Post-payment test audit of the Toronto Transit Commission and preparation of the annual report.	3 Audit Clerks
	(b)	Post-payment test audit of the Gray Coach Lines, Limited and preparation of the annual report.	
	(c)	Post-payment detailed audit of the Bloor-Danforth-University Avenue Subway accounts.	

6.	(a)	Post-payment audit of the Metropolitan Toronto Board of Commissioners of Police for the Metropolitan Corporation and preparation of the annual report on special funds	4 Audit Clerks
	(b)	Verification of all revenue for the Metropolitan Toronto Licensing Commission.	
	(c)	Verification of all revenue for the Magistrates' Courts.	
	(d)	Verification of all revenue for the Riverdale Hospital and preparation of the report to the Ontario Hospital Services Commission.	
	(e)	Verification of all revenue for the Metropolitan Jail and committals to jail by Court Order.	
	(f)	Post-payment audit of the Toronto and York Roads Commission and preparation of the annual report	
	(g)	Verification of the amount charged to the Metropolitan Corporation by the County of Peel re Malton Road.	
7.	(a)	Post-payment audit of the Metropolitan Toronto Civil Defence Organization and preparation of the annual report	3 Audit Clerks
	(b)	Verification of all revenue for the Registry Office for the Registry Division of the City of Toronto.	
	(c)	Verification of all revenue for the Registry Office for the East and West Riding of the County of York.	
	(d)	Verification of all revenue for the Land Titles Office in the City of Toronto.	
	(e)	Verification of all revenue and detailed audit of all disbursements of support money for the Metropolitan Toronto Juvenile and Family Court.	
	(f)	Verification of all revenue for the Metropolitan Waterworks System and preparation of the annual report.	
	(g)	Verification of all departmental revenue, other than Treasury Department, Police Department, Welfare Department, and Magistrates' Courts.	
	(h)	Verification of all stores records.	
8.		The preparation and filing of all correspondence.	2 Clerks
9.		General supervision.	Auditor
		Total permanent staff	34

4. Statement to show to what extent, in the opinion of the Metropolitan Auditor, there is overlapping of services of the Metropolitan Audit Department in relation to the Audit Departments and outside auditors of the thirteen local municipalities and the Metropolitan Organization.

No area auditor audits the books and accounts of any of the organizations for which the Metropolitan Auditor performs his audit, nor does the Metropolitan Auditor examine the books and accounts of any organizations for the audit of which the area auditors are responsible, with the following minor exceptions:

1. Examination of Court of Revision Orders, County Judge Orders, etc. at the offices of the area municipalities in order to verify the correctness of the amounts due to the Metropolitan Corporation under Section 53 etc. of The Assessment Act. One employee does this verification in about three days.

2. Examination of certain expense accounts of the City of Toronto in connection with the sharing of such total expense between the City and the Metropolitan Corporation on a percentage basis under the Service Agreement between the two corporations. One employee does this verification in about four days.

3. In connection with the audit of the Metropolitan School Board's payments to area Boards of Education for maintenance assistance, auxiliary classes costs, and non-resident fees, it is necessary to examine the books of the Boards of Education to ascertain the correctness of such payments. This examination is not for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of the financial statements of the Boards, but for ascertaining the correctness of the allocation of figures in the formulae authorized by the School Board for calculation of such payments.

4. The Metropolitan Corporation maintains a complete record of all debentures issued by it, and each area municipality keeps records of the debentures issued for it by the Metropolitan Corporation. Each area municipality keeps records of the debentures issued by it prior to 1954, and which are still unmatured, and the Metropolitan Corporation keeps records of the debentures assumed by it from the area municipalities. To the extent that the area auditors verify such debenture records in the books of the area municipalities and the Metropolitan Auditor verifies such debenture records in the books of the Metropolitan Corporation, there is a duplicate verification of the same information in the books of different organizations.

In my opinion, any overlapping of services of the Metropolitan Audit Department in relation to the Audit Departments and outside auditors of the thirteen local municipalities is an insignificant factor of the total work load.

III. City of Toronto Audit Department

1. Give total number of permanent and temporary (including casual) employees of the Department, Board, etc. as of December 31st in each of the years 1952 to 1960:

Year	Number of Employees as at December 31st			Salary Expenditure
	Permanent	Temporary	Total	
1952	47	7	54	$212,044.71
1953	42	12	54	224,379.31
1954	42	10	52	210,774.41
1955	42	7	49	216,697.81
1956	46	4	50	210,512.97
1957	44	-	44	213,286.93
1958	44	-	44	216,766.84
1959	46	-	46	233,353.85
1960	46	1	47	238,102.56

2. Functions of City Audit Department

1 (a) Statutory duties of the City Auditor imposed by The City of Toronto Act, 1909; among other things, and briefly stated are:

Shall examine, check and audit all accounts of receipts and expenditures of public moneys and (so far as he can legally do so) the books and vouchers of all outside bodies in whose accounts the City is financially interested.

Shall check the monthly statement showing the amounts expended out of the various appropriations which when so checked shall be forwarded to the Board of Control.

Shall not permit any Department to overdraw its appropriation and shall see that each item of expenditure is charged only to the proper appropriation or subdivision of appropriation and shall exercise supervision over the methods of bookkeeping and accounting in the various Departments.

Shall from time to time check the cash balances of the tellers in the Treasurer's Department and verify all bank balances monthly, and shall see that complete records of all the City's property, revenue producing or otherwise, are made and kept up.

Shall see that no illegal expenditures are made of the funds of the City.

Shall pass before payment all progress and final certificates on contracts, paysheets of departments and orders on the Treasurer of whatever description and shall countersign all cheques issued by the Treasurer on any of the City's bank accounts.

Shall immediately report to the Board of Control upon ascertaining that a shortage exists in the accounts of any employee in any department.

Shall perform such other duties as may be imposed by by-law of the City Council.

1 (b) Statutory duties of the City Auditor imposed by the Municipal Act, R.S.O. 1960, and regulations therefore, among other things, comprise the following, briefly stated:

Shall in addition to his duties in respect of the corporation audit the accounts and transactions of every local board as defined in The Department of Municipal Affairs Act, (Section 228)

Shall perform such duties as are prescribed by the Department and also such duties as may be required by the Council or any local board, that do not conflict with the duties prescribed by the Department (Section 229). The council of any municipality may provide that all accounts shall be audited before payment (Section 231). The City of Toronto Act, 1909 provides that such prepayment audit shall be made.

The regulations issued by the Department and entitled "Duties and Instructions for Municipal Auditors as Prescribed by the Department" set out the duty of a municipal auditor as follows:-

"The statutory duty of the auditor is to audit all accounts affecting the Corporation. The audit must cover not only financial transactions of the corporation as carried on by or under the authority of the municipal council, but also accounts and financial transactions of school boards,

2. Functions (cont'd)

local water, electric, hydro or utility commissions, local board of health, public library board, parks board, cemetery board, police commission, civic hospital board, housing commission, and every other local municipal board or commission. The audit should also cover all accounts and financial transactions of any trust fund, reserve or other special fund which is under the control of the council or any of the above mentioned local boards and all of the aforesaid audits must cover the whole of the calendar year."

1. (b) More specifically and in detail these regulations set out the mode and manner in which the audit of the accounts and transactions are to be conducted and otherwise verified by the auditor in respect of the corporation and of its boards and commissions and also the manner in which the reports on the audits made are to be prepared and rendered to the Department.

1. (c) Statutory duties of the City Auditor imposed by other Acts and regulations therefore:

These are not listed since these acts merely amplify the provisions of The Municipal Act and the regulations therefore.

2. Duties imposed on the City Auditor by City by-law #12669 are specifically in respect of the payment of accounts and are as follows:

After payment of the account has been ordered by the Council, the City Auditor shall examine and audit the same before payment thereof, and no account shall be paid by the City Treasurer until the said City Auditor has certified that the same has passed through the stages required by this By-law, and may be legally paid by the Corporation.

3. Other duties or functions are:

(a) Attend meetings of Council and submit information when called to the floor of Council.
(b) Attend meetings of the Board of Control and submit information when requested.
(c) Attend meetings of the Heads of Departments under the Chairmanship of the Vice-Chairman of the Board of Control.
(d) Act on various sub-committees of Heads of Departments appointed by the Board of Control.

In addition an examination of the books and accounts of private enterprises or other organizations is made for the following purposes:

1. Expropriation of lands by City going to arbitration for settlement of claims for business disturbance.

2. Various charitable institutions for purpose of verifying rates per day and deficits on operations and the accounts rendered to the Provincial Department of Welfare for grants towards the cost of relief and welfare services, on the request of the Commissioner of Public Welfare.

3. National Soccer League re lease of Stanley Park to check rental to be paid on basis of a percentage of gate receipts.

4. The Grenadier Restaurant Limited re lease of building in High Park to check rental to be paid on basis of percentage of revenue.

5. Toronto Hydro-Electric System Employees Charitable and Welfare Fund at the request of the Commissioners.

Workload of City Audit Department

The groups, by which allocation of audits are assigned to separate divisions of the staff and the number of employees assigned to each such group , are as follows:

Group		Number of Employees in the group	Total Employees in the Establishment of the Department
Prepayment audit section:			
Accounts	3		
Paysheets	6		
District Welfare Offices	3	12	12
Post Payment audit section:			
City's stores	2		
Departmental accounts	11		
Pension funds	1		
City's banks	1	15	15
City Corporation audit section:			
Finance Department Central Accounts		4	4
Boards & Commissions:			
Toronto Hydro-Electric Commissioners			
North Tor. Community Corp'n.	4		
Board of Education			
Runnymede Hospital			
Toronto Harbour Commissioners	4		
Canadian National Exhibition			
Toronto Public Library			
Parking Authority of Toronto			
Housing Authority of Toronto	3	11	11
Clerical		3	3
Distributed - 1/8 Prepayment)			
3/8 Post Prepayment)			
4/8 City Corporation)			
City Auditor		1	1
Distributed - 2/8 Post Payment)			
5/8 Boards & Commissions)			
1/8 City Corporation)			
Deputy City Auditor		1	1
Distributed - ½ Prepayment)			
½ City Corporation)			
Total Authorized Establishment		47	47

CHAPTER 5

OFFICES OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL AND THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF TORONTO

Although only these two offices returned questionnaires, it is probable that some of the other area municipalities have staff exclusively devoted to similar functions. It is also possible that some of this staff, not being included in any of the organized local departments, may not have been included in any of the questionnaires returned. The 1960 expenditures for the two offices total less than $80,000; no estimate has been made of the cost under an amalgamated system.

It is clear however that an amalgamated municipality would require a considerable staff to serve its chief executive officer.

The summary prepared by the Metropolitan Clerk of information collected on the two offices follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY METROPOLITAN TORONTO CLERK'S DEPARTMENT, OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON THE OFFICE OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL AND THE OFFICE OF THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF TORONTO

Questions 1 and 2:

Names of Municipalities and Departments Covered in this Summary

Area Municipality	The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto
Mayor's Office, City of Toronto	Office of Chairman of Metropolitan Council
(Total: 1)	(Total: 1)

Question 3:

No answer required. (Applies only to Boards, Commissions, etc.)

Questions 4 and 5:

Administrative Structure and Staff

Head:

Mayor's Office	Salary - December 31, 1960
Executive Assistant to Mayor.....	$ 12,100.00
Chairman's Office	
Administrative Assistant, Chairman's Office.....	$ 7,418.00

Other Staff:

	General Administration
Mayor's Office	Perm.
Secretary.....	1
Chief Clerk.....	1
Clerks-General.....	3
Clerk-Stenographers.....	4
Total.....	9
Chairman's Office	
Clerks-General.....	2
Clerk-Stenographers.....	2
*Chauffeur.....	1
Total.....	5

(* Position of chauffeur is not shown as part of staff of Mayor's Office. It is understood that such employee is considered a member of the staff of the City Property Department.)

Question 6:

Total Wage and Salary Expenditures as of December 31st, 1952-60, for Permanent and Temporary Employees

Mayor's Office

Year	Permanent	Temp. (Casual)	Total
1952	$ 36,059.00	$ 694.00	$ 36,753.00
1953	36,034.00	190.00	36,224.00
1954	37,388.00	113.00	37,501.00
1955	37,191.00	431.00	37,622.00
1956	40,502.00	105.00	40,607.00
1957	41,596.00	692.00	42,288.00
1958	46,031.00	337.00	46,368.00
1959	48,438.00	276.00	48,714.00
1960	49,641.00	573.00	50,214.00
Totals....	$372,880.00 *	$ 3,411.00	$ 376,291.00

(* - Amount of salary for Mayor's office does not include salary for Chauffeur as does amount for Chairman's office. It is understood that the salary for this employee would be included in the return of the City Property Department.)

Chairman's Office

Year	Permanent	Temp. (Casual)	Total
1953	$ 4,583.00	$ - - -	$ 4,583.00
1954	13,916.00	251.00	14,167.00
1955	17,577.00	390.00	17,967.00
1956	22,007.00	431.00	22,438.00
1957	22,862.00	261.00	23,123.00
1958	23,414.00	668.00	24,082.00
1959	27,984.00	394.00	28,378.00
1960	28,510.00	397.00	28,907.00
Totals....	$160,853.00	$ 2,792.00	$ 163,645.00

Questions 7 and 8:

No. of Staff as of December 31st, 1952-60 and Increases or decreases for each year

Mayor's Office

Year	Permanent	Temporary	Total	Annual Increase or Decrease	Reasons
1952	10	0	10	-	-
1953	10	0	10	-	-
1954	10	0	10	-	-
1955	10	0	10	-	-
1956	10	0	10	-	-
1957	10	0	10	-	-
1958	10	0	10	-	-
1959	10	0	10	-	-
1960	10	0	10	-	-

Questions 7 and 8 (cont'd)

Chairman's Office

Year	Permanent	Temporary	Total	Annual Increase or Decrease	Reasons
1953	3	0	3		
1954	5	0	5	+ 2	) completing
1955	6	0	6	+ 1	) establishment
1956	6	0	6	-	
1957	6	0	6	-	
1958	6	0	6	-	
1959	6	0	6	-	
1960	6	0	6	-	

Question 9:

Expenditures for Operation (other than salaries or wages) and for services of private firms in 1960

	Mayor's Office	Chairman's Office
Total expenditures for operation.... (Other than salaries or wages)	$ 8,745.00	$ 11,146.00
Total expenditures for services of private firms.....	$ 160.00	$ - - -
Totals....	$ 8,905.00 *	$ 11,146.00

(* - Amount for operation of Mayor's Office does not include expense for operation and maintenance of Mayor's automobile as does the amount for the Chairman's Office. It is understood that such expense would be included in the return of the City Property Department.)

CHAPTER 6
SEPARATE CLERK'S DEPARTMENTS

The existence of combined clerk-treasurer's departments in several of the area municipalities necessitated a separate analysis for these, which is contained in Chapter 7 following. This chapter deals only with the five area municipalities and Metropolitan Toronto which have Separate Clerk's Departments. The area municipalities involved are the City of Toronto, North York, Scarborough, Etobicoke and York.

In 1960 the combined staff of these six clerk's departments totalled 163, and their combined expenditures exceeded one and one-half million dollars. While these are impressive totals which on first thought might be expected to reduce under an amalgamated system having only one council, it is the Metropolitan Clerk's opinion that at least as large a staff as the present combined total would be required if an amalgamated clerk's department were to provide an adequate standard of service to the whole Metropolitan area. The Metropolitan Clerk's summary and his comments on the probable changes which could be expected under amalgamation follow on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO CLERK'S DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON SEPARATE CLERK'S DEPARTMENTS

(See also Summary prepared by the Metropolitan Toronto Treasury Department of information collected on combined Clerk-Treasurer Departments.)

Questions 1 and 2:

Names of Municipalities and Departments covered in this Summary

Area Municipalities		The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto
Clerk's Department,	Township of Etobicoke	Metropolitan Clerk's Department
" "	Township of North York	
" "	Township of Scarborough	
" "	City of Toronto	
" "	Township of York	
(Total: 5)		(Total: 1)

(Note: The remaining Eight Municipalities which have, or have had, a combined Clerk-Treasurer's Department and/or General Office, and which in some cases are too small for any functional classifications, have been included with the report submitted by the Metropolitan Treasurer.)

Question 3:

No answer required. (Applies only to Boards, Commissions, etc.)

Questions 4 and 5:

Administrative Structure and Staff

Heads and Deputy Heads:

	Area Municipalities		Metropolitan Clerk's	
	No.	Salary (as of Dec.31,1960)	No.	Salary (as at Dec.31,1960
Administrative Heads.....	5	$ 62,908.00	1	$13,000.00
Deputy Heads	5	42,986.00	1	9,700.00
Totals.....	10	$105,894.00	2	$22,700.00

Administrative Structure and Staff (cont'd)

Other Staff:

DIVISIONS

No. of Divisions:	(5) General Administration and Clerical		(4) Council and Committee Secretariat		(4) Elections - Courts of Revision		Totals		
Job Classifications	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Total
Chief Clerks, Supervisors, etc.	6				2		8		8
Committee Secretaries/ Assistant Secretaries			12				12		12
Clerks General	33				19		52		52
Clerk-Stenographers	18	1	16	1	1		35	2	37
Clerk-Typists	6	1			3	4	9	5	14
Switchboard Operators	7	1					7	1	8
By-law Enforcement Officer	1						1		1
Public Information Officer	2						2		2
Archivist	1						1		1
Property Evaluator	1						1		1
Investigator	1						1		1
Printer	1						1		1
Chauffeur	1						1		1
Totals	78	3	28	1	25	4	131	8	139

(Note: The General Administration and Clerical Division includes branches such as Vital Statistics, Public Information, Records and Archives, Industrial-Property, Mail and Mimeograph, Switchboard, etc.)

Summary of Staff - Area Municipalities

No. of Heads and Deputy Heads.....10
Other Staff (as above).....139

Total.....149

Staff - Metropolitan Clerk's Department as of December 31, 1960

	DIVISIONS General Administration and Clerical		Council and Committee Secretariat		Totals		
	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Total
Head and Deputy Head.....	2				2		2
Committee Secretaries.....			3		3		3
Clerks General.....	5				5		5
Clerks Stenographers.....	4		–		4		4
Totals....	11		3		14		14

Questions 4 and 5 (cont'd)

Comparison of Staff Figures

Total Staff (including Heads and Deputy Heads) - Area Municipalities.....149
Total Staff (including Head and Deputy Head) - Metro Clerk's Dept..... 14

Question 6:

Total Wage and Salary Expenditures as of December 31st, 1952-60, for Permanent and Temporary Employees.

Area Clerk's Departments (5)

Year	Permanent	Temporary	Total
1952	$ 283,422.00	$ 17,166.42	$ 300,588.45
1953	315,046.45	22,749.70	337,796.15
1954	321,141.65	28,471.09	349,612.74
1955	365,939.18	20,255.69	386,194.87
1956	461,129.81	25,603.31	486,733.12
1957	484,686.26	10,646.45	495,332.71
1958	531,406.29	26,416.20	557,822.49
1959	553,871.70	17,299.31	571,171.01
1960	657,582.59	31,722.43	689,305.02
Totals.....	$3,974,225.96	$ 200,330.60	$ 4,174,556.56

Metropolitan Clerk's Department.

Year	Permanent	Temporary	Total
1953	$ 15,831.98	$ - -	$ 15,831.98
1954	52,569.77	990.08	53,559.85
1955	61,068.06	- -	61,068.06
1956	63,343.68	- -	63,343.68
1957	66,329.35	483.04	66,812.39
1958	68,972.83	340.44	69,313.27
1959	72,411.03	- -	72,411.03
1960	75,846.24	- -	75,846.24
Totals.....	$ 476,372.94	$ 1,813.56	$ 478,186.50

Questions 7 and 8:

No. of Staff as of December 31st, 1952-60, and increases or decreases for each year.

Year	Permanent	Temporary	Total	Annual Increase or Decrease	Reasons For Increases or Decreases
1952	81	3	84	--	All increases and one decrease accounted for by increased work-load, or re-organization of departments.
1953	82	3	85	+ 1	
1954	89	4	93	+ 8	
1955	102	4	106	+13	
1956	114	5	119	+13	
1957	114	4	118	- 1	
1958	121	7	128	+10	
1959	130	8	138	+10	
1960	141	8	149	+11	

Questions 7 and 8 (cont'd)

No. of Staff as of December 31st, 1952-60, and increases or decreases for each year (cont'd)

Metropolitan Clerk's Department

Year	Permanent	Temporary	Total	Increase or Decrease	Reasons
1953	9	--	9	0	
1954	13	--	13	+ 4	(Completing Establishment)
1955	12	--	12	- 1	
1956	14	--	14	+ 2	
1957	14	1	15	+ 1	
1958	14	--	14	- 1	
1959	14	--	14	0	
1960	14	--	14	0	

Question 9:

Expenditures for Operation of Clerk's Departments (other than Salaries or Wages) and for Services of Private Firms in 1960.

	Area Municipalities (5)	Metropolitan Clerk
Total expenditures for operation..... (other than salaries or wages)	$ 609,959.00	$ 18,428.00
Total expenditures for services of private firms.....	100,384.00	50,599.00
Totals.....	$ 710,343.00	$ 69,027.00

Question 10:

Functions and Workload

Functions or Divisions

Function or Division	No. in Area Clerk's Department	No. in Metro Clerk's Department
General Administration and Clerical.... (This Division includes branches such as: Vital Statistics, Public Information, Records and Archives, Industrial-Property, Mail-Printing, Switchboard, etc.)	5	1
Council and Committee Secretariat.....	4	1
Elections - Courts of Revision.....	4	-

Question 10 (cont'd)

Notes re Functions

(1) The questionnaire returned by the Township of York did not show division of functions and contains the following comment:

> "Not diversified into sections. The general work load is carried out by all members of the staff as assigned, there being a staff of 13 members".

(2) Only three of the returns show the percentages of total current expenditures applicable to each function. Toronto indicated that breakdown is not available and York indicated that Clerk's Department is not diversified into sections. Therefore, it is not possible to "calculate the weighted average percentage of total expenditures which each function accounts for in all of the local departments combined".

Notes re Workload re each Function

(1) Three of the municipalities (North York, Scarborough and Toronto) showed workload information for various functions. However, no information was given in this connection by Etobicoke and York.

In addition, each municipality answering the question used a different approach to assessing the work load. Therefore, there is no basis for "calculating the cost per unit of workload of performing the various function in each local department".

Question 11:

Duplication of Functions

Comments of Area Municipalities

North York and Toronto did not answer this question.

Etobicoke indicated that there was no duplication of functions.

Scarborough indicated that there may be a small amount of duplication in the General Administration division but otherwise there is no duplication.

York advised that there is no appreciable amount of duplication.

Comments of Metropolitan Clerk:

While the work performed in the Metropolitan Clerk's Department and the Clerk's Departments in each of the respective Area Municipalities is common in nature and structure, in my opinion there is little or no substantial duplication or overlapping; nor is there duplication or overlapping between the work now being performed by this Department and any other Metropolitan Department, Board or Commission.

COMMENTS
REQUESTED FROM METROPOLITAN CLERK
RESPECTING PROBABLE CHANGES IN STRUCTURE OF CLERK'S DEPARTMENTS
UNDER FULL AMALGAMATION OF AREA MUNICIPALITIES INTO A SINGLE
MUNICIPALITY.

STRUCTURE:

If total amalgamation became effective, it is assumed that there would be a unified Clerk's Department with a head office and strategically-located regional branches, and that the staff of this single department would include one administrative head, one or more deputy heads or division heads, and other personnel.

To service adequately the numerous divisions needed for the head office and regional branches and to handle speedily and effectively the anticipated volume of work required to be processed in such a large amalgamated municipality, it would appear that at least the total number of personnel presently employed in the Clerks' Departments of the Area Municipalities and the Metropolitan Corporation would be required for the Clerks' Department and other related functions.

EFFICIENCY POTENTIAL:

Based on the experience of some types of organizations where operations have been centralized, it may be contended that, theoretically at least, the overall efficiency of a unified Clerk's Department would increase from an administrative viewpoint through the fuller utilization of existing machine equipment, the introduction of new systems that may be feasible in a large-scale operation, and the greater specialization of duties. In practice, however, any advantages that may be gained by unification may be offset by the possibility of the unified operation becoming less personalized and unwieldy and therefore tending to be less efficient. In addition, it is not anticipated that there would be any substantial reduction in salary or wage costs having regard for the previous statement that it would appear that at least the aggregate number of personnel in the present Clerks' Departments would be required for the Clerks' Department and other related functions.

Also, there is room for speculation as to whether the needs of the respective communities would be met as effectively by a unified system as by the present individual Clerks' Departments operating in the various Area Municipalities, each of which is able to maintain close contact and rapport with the citizens of the local community.

CHAPTER 7

COMBINED CLERK-TREASURER'S DEPARTMENTS

In the following eight area municipalities the Clerk and Treasury functions are combined:

East York
Forest Hill
Leaside
Mimico
New Toronto
Long Branch
Weston
Swansea

Since it was impossible to separate the staff and expenditure totals as between the clerk and treasury functions, these eight departments have been summarized together.

With a combined staff of 100 and total expenditures of nearly $600,000 in 1960, these departments together form a significant part of the present municipal structure.

Under amalgamation the functions presently performed by these eight departments would be transferred, mainly to the amalgamated Clerk's Department and Treasury Department (a total of six out of the combined staff of 100 are performing non clerk-treasurer functions as Building Inspectors, Welfare Officers, etc., and would be transferred elsewhere). Whether this would result in savings over the present system is difficult to say, but some of the replies to the question on duplication, noted in the following summary, would seem to indicate that some savings might be expected due to a decrease in the aggregate number of council and committee meetings, the possible extended use of mechanical methods, and larger area to be served by Courts of Revision. This would suggest that the size of some of the Departments in the smaller municipalities may be such that it is difficult to make most efficient use of personnel through specialization, division of labour, and use of mechanical aids. If this is so, then certain economies of scale might be expected to

follow the merger of such smaller departments into larger ones. More thorough investigation would undoubtedly be required however, before it could be stated with any certainty that such economies would result.

The summary of combined Clerk-Treasurer's Departments, prepared by the Metropolitan Treasury Department, follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO TREASURY DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON COMBINED CLERK-TREASURER'S DEPARTMENTS

The information furnished by 8 municipalities: East York, Forest Hill, Leaside, Long Branch, Mimico, New Toronto, Swansea, and Weston, in view of the size of their individual operations, has not permitted the requested functional classification particularly in view of the fact that generally there is no clear line of demarcation between the treasury and clerk functions. Subject to such limitations the following summary has been compiled from the answers received to the questionnaire.

Number of Administrative Heads (Clerk-Treasurers, Treasurers, and Clerks)	11
Salaries of Administrative Heads as at December 31,1960	$90,912
Number of Deputy or Division Heads	9
Salaries of Deputy or Division Heads as at December 31,1960	$53,783

STAFF (other than above Heads and Deputy Heads)

Permanent:		
Clerks	24	
Clerk-Typists	8	
Typists	12	
Machine operators	3	
Cashiers	7	
Switchboard operators	4	
Statistician	1	
Building Inspectors	2	
Planning and Building Commissioner	1	
Welfare Officers	2	
Parking Meter Maintenance Man	1	
Cleaners	1	
	66	
part-time:		
Solicitor	1	
Social Worker	1	
Medical Officer of Health	1	69
Temporary:		
Clerks	9	
Building Inspector	1	
Cleaner	1	11
TOTAL:		80

SALARY EXPENDITURES

	Permanent	Temporary	Total
1952	$242,221	$ 8,048	$250,269
1953	259,487	12,168	271,655
1954	256,751	11,488	268,239
1955	283,904	10,060	293,964
1956	297,595	12,275	309,870
1957	319,783	5,167	324,950
1958	335,571	9,428	344,999
1959	367,727	11,453	379,180
1960	401,078	11,426	412,504

STAFF AS OF DECEMBER 31

	Permanent	Temporary	Total	Annual Increases or Decreases*	Reasons for Increases
1952	78	7	85	-	Returns indicate that
1953	79	11	90	5	there was a total
1954	74	9	83	7*	reduction of 6 due to the
1955	80	7	87	4	assumption by Metro of
1956	80	9	89	2	responsibility for assess-
1957	82	7	89	-	ment, but that all other
1958	84	7	91	2	fluctuations reflect a
1959	88	8	96	5	general increase in the
1960	89	11	100	4	volume of work.

EXPENDITURES OTHER THAN SALARIES

Expenditures for operation of local departments for 1960		$ 140,381
Expenditures for services of Private Firms, etc. in 1960:		
Audit Fees	$ 23,718	
Legal Fees	19,910	43,628
Grand Total of all non-salary expenditures for 1960		$ 184,009

DEGREE OF DUPLICATION

East York, Leaside, and Weston did not answer the questions.

Forest Hill, Mimico, New Toronto, and Swansea replied "No duplication" and did not express any opinion as to whether this might always be the position.

Long Branch replied:

Treasury Department -

"It is probable that, if properly managed, some savings in costs could be effected if there was some kind of merging with one or more municipalities owing to the larger turnover of workload, and the possible extended use of mechanical methods. Previous experience however, would appear to indicate that such economies have not been effected in the past".

Clerk's Department -

"Meetings	- Unified Municipality should result in lesser aggregate number of meetings.
Clerk	- Unified Municipality would not require to have Notices with regard to O.M.B. hearings for Capital Expenditures.
Elections and Courts of Revision	- There may be some saving in expense if Course of Revision served larger areas".

CHAPTER 8
HOUSING AUTHORITIES

As noted in Chapter 1, the Metropolitan Housing Authority is really an emanation of the Province, and not an integral part of Municipal Government. For the purposes of this survey however, it was deemed advisable to include a summary of the activities of the City of Toronto and Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authorities, and upon request the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority agreed to prepare such a summary. The City Authority had already submitted a questionnaire.

In 1960 the combined staff of the two authorities totalled 159, being split almost evenly between the two. Their combined total expenditures came to over two million dollars but this figure evidently includes the municipal taxes levied against the housing projects which the Authorities administer. Total wages and salaries paid amounted to approximately $690,000. The administration and maintenance of the projects evidently accounted for the bulk of the remaining expenditures.

In considering the possible effects of amalgamation upon the two Authorities, the question as to whether there is any duplication in their functions would have to be explored. Unfortunately the questionnaire returned by the City Authority contains no reply to the question on duplication, and hence the summary makes no reference to it. A glance at the summary table which compares staff functions of the two authorities would however seem to indicate that some duplication probably exists at least at the administrative levels. Without further study it would be difficult to say how much of this possible existing duplication might be eliminated under amalgamation.

A different but related question is whether a larger single authority might effect savings in administration and maintenance through greater division of labour and specialization and possibly through greater use of mechanical aids in handling records, etc. This is really the question of optimum size and efficiency; would a larger authority be able to operate more efficiently than the separate existing authorities? Or would its size, especially in future with the addition of more projects, become so large that inefficiencies would develop? Again, further investigation would seem to be required before attempting to answer these questions.

The decision as to whether the authorities should be amalgamated or not will of course depend on other considerations as well. For one thing the decision would not be a matter of municipal concern only, but would also involve the senior levels of government whose approval of any change would have to be secured. In addition questions of housing policies are also involved; such matters lie beyond the scope of this report however.

Another related problem which is not dealt with in the following summary but which would have to be considered along with the question of amalgamating the Authorities involves the two municipal Limited Dividend Housing Corporations. The Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Limited is dealt with to some extent by the Metropolitan Toronto Welfare and Housing Department in its summary on welfare contained in Chapter 17; this company deals only with the provision of elderly persons' housing. The City of Toronto Limited Dividend Housing Corporation deals with unsubsidized low rental Limited Dividend projects in various parts of the city (not elderly persons' housing). The administrative supervision of the City Limited Dividend Corporation is handled by the City Housing Authority; in the case of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company administrative supervision is by the Metropolitan Welfare and Housing Department. In each case administrative costs incurred are presumably reimbursed by the Limited Dividend Company concerned. Obviously if the authorities were amalgamated a decision would have to be made regarding the Limited Dividend Companies. As they deal with distinctly different types of housing it might make more sense to maintain them as separate organizations even if the authorities were merged.

The summary of information collected on Housing Authorities follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO HOUSING AUTHORITY, OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON THE CITY OF TORONTO AND THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO HOUSING AUTHORITIES

The following table summarizes the main points of interest and illustrates where possible areas of duplication may exist. The summary does not delve into precise details of duplication such as how work orders for repairs are completed by both Housing Authorities, and other related items.

In comparing the City's submission to that submitted by the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority, there are certain points worthy of mention. Page 5 of the Questionnaire refers to expenditures for services of private firms; the Metropolitan Housing Authority's list is very much lengthier than that of the City.

Legal and audit fees for The Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority in 1960 amounted to $4,186.00. The City lists only $1,000.00 as consulting fees for a solicitor. It is quite possible that the City of Toronto Housing Authority is able to call upon the services of the City's Legal and Treasurer's Departments. If such is the case, these costs presumably would not be absorbed by the Authority. Other services contracted out by the Metropolitan Authority include Liability and Fidelity Insurance, fumigation and pest control, garbage disposal, window cleaning and maintenance of certain equipment.

		Metropolitan Toronto Housing Authority	Housing Authority of Toronto	Combined
Number of Projects		2	1 plus 1 Limited Dividend and Miscellaneous	4 plus Miscellaneous
Number of Units		1775	1625	3400
STAFF				
Administrative:	Permanent	22)	14)	36)
	Temporary	-)80	-)79	-)159
Maintenance:	Permanent	58)	56)	114)
	Temporary	-)	9)	9)
STAFF FUNCTIONS ADMINISTRATIVE				
Senior				
Executive Director		1	1	2
Secretary		1	1	2
Accountant		1	1	2
Managerial		3	1	4
Supervisory				
Assistant Manager		1	1	2
Other		-	2	2
Clerical				
Assistant Accountant		1	1	1
Cashiers		4	2	6
Accounting		1	1	2
General		5	2	7
Tenant Selection and Relations		4	1	5
MAINTENANCE				
Senior				
Superintendent of Maintenance		1	1	2
Chief Operating Engineer		1	1	2
Supervisory				
Foremen		8	4	12
General				
Stationary Engineers		5	8	13
Janitors		21	25	46
Groundsmen		8	6	14
Maintenance Men		9	10	19
Painters		-	9	9
Stockkeepers		2	1	3
Watchmen		3	-	3
Remuneration to Members		$333.00	$5,116.00	$5,449.00
Wages and Salaries		$340,993.00	$348,916.00	$689,909.00
Administration and Maintenance		$642,750.00	$649,223.00	$1,291,973.00
Relocation		-	$22,354.00	$22,354.00

CHAPTER 9
LEGAL SERVICES

In addition to Metropolitan Toronto only three of the area municipalities have separate Legal Departments: they are the City of Toronto, North York and Scarborough. In the Township of York the Clerk's and Legal Departments are combined. The remaining nine area municipalities rely on private firms for their legal services, and in 1960 spent some $77,000 for such services.

In 1960 the total staff in the separate Legal Departments of Metropolitan Toronto, the City of Toronto, North York and Scarborough numbered 77, and their combined total expenditures amounted to over a half million dollars.

Under amalgamation it is presumed that one large legal department would provide legal services to the entire municipal structure, eliminating the expensive use of private legal firms now in evidence. The cost and benefits of such an amalgamated legal department compared with the present situation could not be reliably estimated without further investigation. In particular such investigation would have to pay attention to the possible savings which an amalgamated department might enjoy because of greater division of labour and specialization, and its possibly lower unit cost of performing work now handled by private legal firms. Against such potential savings the possibility of an amalgamated department being too large and unwieldy for most efficient operation would have to be considered. As regards workload it is possible that under amalgamation reductions could be expected due to the decreased number of council and council committee meetings requiring attendance of legal staff, a possible decrease in the number of written legal opinions, a possible decrease in the number of Ontario Municipal Board Hearings requiring attendance, a possible decrease in the number of by-laws requiring preparation, and elimination of legal agreements with other area municipalities. On the other hand it might be anticipated that an amalgamated system would make somewhat more extensive use of legal services, and insofar as this occurred, workload would be expected to increase.

The summary of information collected on legal services follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO LEGAL DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON LEGAL SERVICES

(a) The following nine area municipalities have no legal departments:

East York
Etobicoke
Forest Hill
Leaside
Long Branch
Mimico
New Toronto
Swansea
Weston

In 1960 the total expenditure of these nine municipalities to private firms for legal services was $77,102.00 approximately.

(b) In the Township of York the Clerk's and Legal Departments are combined. In 1960 the amount of this municipality's expenses for legal services was $22,130.00 approximately.

(c) North York, Scarborough and Toronto have their own Legal Departments and an analysis of the Questionnaires completed for these departments follows:

Question	3 Areas	Metro
4. The organizational charts do not show comparable staff divisions		
5. Solicitors (Heads of Departments)	3 (1 part time)	1
Salary paid by Municipalities	$ 36,107	$ 19,000
Deputy Solicitors	2	1
Salary	$23,300	$ 13,200
Corporation Counsel	1	-
Salary	$ 12,000	-

Question		3 Areas	Metro
6. Total salary and wage expenditures (all staff)			
	1952	$164,454	-
	1953	169,676	-
	1954	162,846	$ 53,615
	1955	196,377	67,412
	1956	220,256	89,386
	1957	254,791	104,414
	1958	289,470	115,638
	1959	312,196	127,166
	1960	315,680	139,332
7. Total Staff	1952	37	-
	1953	34	-
	1954	36	10
	1955	42	13
	1956	47	18
	1957	49	22
	1958	52	23
	1959	54	22
	1960	54	23*

*Note: Metro figures do not include 3 Clerks in 1959 and 1960 for acquisition of lands for the Bloor-Danforth-University Subway

8. Annual Staff	Increase +		
	Decrease -		
	1952		
	1953	-3	
	1954	+2	+10
	1955	+6	+3
	1956	+5	+5
	1957	+2	+4
	1958	+3	+1
	1959	+2	-1
	1960	0	+1

Reasons given for increases:

Organization of Legal Department 1954-55	+4	+13
Increased responsibilities 1955-57		+3

Question	3 Areas	Metro
9. Total 1960 expenditures for operations	$ 74,790	$ 25,736
Expenditures to private firms, etc.,	5,750	5,100
Total expenditures other than wages and salaries	80,540	30,836

10. FUNCTIONS

(1) Number of bodies other than the municipality for which legal services are performed	22	11

(2) General legal services are performed in all cases. In addition to this one area legal department carries out appraisals of real property.

WORKLOAD

(1) Meetings		
(a) regularly attended	15	14
(b) attendance on request	24	5
(2) Written legal opinions	850 (estimate)	61

	3 Areas Comp.	3 Areas Pend.	Metro Comp.	Metro Pend.
(3) Contested actions, etc. completed in 1960 and pending at the year's end				
(a) Division Court	93	63	18	5
(b) County Court	25	106	19	22
(c) Supreme Court	39	101	8	19
(d) Land compensation arbitrations	20		17	
(e) Assessment Appeals, Court of Revision	3		10	
(f) Assessment Appeals, County Judge	9		65	
(g) Assessment Appeals O.M.B.	2	0	31	5
(h) Motions other than interlocutory	10	5	5	5
(i) By-law prosecutions, Magistrates' Court	713	22	286	

WORKLOAD (cont'd)	Comp.	Pend.	Comp.	Pend.
(j) By-law Prosecutions				
County Court	14	8	1	1
(k) Mechanics Lien actions	1	3	5	9
(l) Appeals to Court of Appeal	8	7	9	3
(m) Appeals to Supreme Court of Canada	1	1	1	0
(n) Other contentious proceedings before judicial bodies				
Stated cases	2	0	0	0
Miscellaneous	16	4	0	0
Prosecutions under Liquor Control and Licence Acts	0		1700	
Prosecutions, juvenile delinquency	0		18	
Child Welfare & Training Act cases	0		12	
Bail Estreats	0		65	

	3 Areas	Metro
(4) Actions pending at the end of 1960 - see summary in (3) above		
(5) Claims		
(a) referred to insurers (2 area municipalities only)	887	550
(b) dealt with by Department	1632	30+
(6) Garnishees handled by Department	832	153
(7) Time spent on Labour Relations matters 1 solicitor for the equivalent of (approximation only)	70 days	100+ days
(8) Time spent on Pension matters information not available		
(9) Ontario Municipal Board hearings on		
(a) capital works	198	105
(b) zoning by-laws and amendments	135	1
(c) official plans and amendments	5	1
(d) plans of subdivision	0	6
(e) other matters	53	1

WORKLOAD (cont'd)

Question		3 Areas	Metro
(10)	Applications to other boards and authorities	76	69
(11)	By-laws prepared by Departments	1677	217
(12)	Agreements prepared		
	(a) construction contracts	202	85
	(b) agreements with other area municipalities or Metro Corporation	10	3
	(c) subdivision agreements	22	0
	(d) other agreements	208	15
(13)	(a) Properties acquired	810	428
	Value	$4,665,000	$11,632,000*
	(* includes properties acquired for Bloor-Danforth-University Subway)		
	(b) Properties sold	92	13
	Value	$681,724	$42,575
	(c) Leases and renewals	50	194
(14)	Legislation applied for:		
	Items	38	24

Question

11. Duplication of functions

Only one of the three area municipalities with legal departments answered this question.

Area Questionnaire:

(a) small amount of duplication, if any

(b) no saving of workload if amalgamation took place

Metro Questionnaire:

(a) small amount of duplication, if any,

(b) decrease if no amalgamation.

Full amalgamation would undoubtedly necessitate a very large legal department, but as the use made of outside firms is at present so extensive, only experience would indicate what is required.

There are some disadvantages to a very large legal department in view of the nature of the work performed. With proper organization, however, there should be little or no change in overall efficiency.

CHAPTER 10

PARKS AND RECREATION

As noted in the following summary, Parks and Recreation services in Metropolitan Toronto are presently handled by a wide variety of departments, boards, commissions and committees, which in addition to specific parks and recreation matters may also deal with golf courses, swimming pools, rinks, arenas, community centres, zoos, playgrounds, playing fields, memorial community halls and gardens, parking lots, and even roads. The fact that in some of the area municipalities parks and recreation functions are performed by departments which also perform works, roads, and other functions, has made it impossible to precisely segregate staff and expenditure totals for parks and recreation alone. It is estimated however, that 1960 parks and recreation staffs totalled about 2,934, with salaries amounting to approximately $4,429,000 and total expenditures (exclusive of capital expenditures and debt charges, but including winter works expenditures) of about $11,185,000. It should be noted that the staff total includes some 2,177 temporary personnel, many of them employed in connection with the winter works programme. A considerable portion of the total staff were employed on a part-time basis.

There are indications that the expenditures, both per capita and as noted in the following summary, per acre of park maintained, vary over a considerable range, implying that the standard of park and recreation services and facilities varies considerably among the municipalities comprising Metropolitan Toronto. It is of course known from other sources (such as the park deficiency map in the draft Metropolitan Official Plan) that many parts of Metro are deficient in parks.

In considering the possible effects of amalgamation therefore, it might be expected that an amalgamated government would take steps to generally raise the level of parks and recreation services in any areas where they may now be seriously deficient. Without further studies it is impossible to estimate what this might cost. Should such further studies take place, the probable costs would have to be weighed against the probable benefits to the Metropolitan area's inhabitants.

Certain operational advantages and disadvantages might also be expected in an amalgamated department; these are dealt with at some length in the following summary. Suffice it to say here that although the possible loss of variety and individuality in local parks programmes could be a serious disadvantage in the long run, much of the present variation in parks and recreation programmes is due not so much to local experimentation as it is

to rather wide differences in the amounts per capita which the various area municipalities can afford to spend on these services. If the financial capability of the various area municipalities were more nearly equal, the argument for retention of local individuality would be considerably stronger. At any rate further investigation would be required in order to ascertain whether or not the operational advantages could be expected to outweigh the disadvantages.

The summary of information collected on parks and recreation follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO PARKS DEPARTMENT, OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON PARKS AND RECREATION

Parks and Recreation services, as they are expressed in the various municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto embrace a very broad range of maintenance and administrative functions. Through Boards, Commissions and Committees are administered anything from open space to roads, parking lots, golf courses, swimming pools, rinks, arenas, community centres, zoos, playgrounds, playing fields. The development, maintenance and programming of areas and facilities adds to the complexity.

To compare the various bodies performing Parks and Recreation functions in each area municipality is possible from the questionnaire results. To achieve reliable statistical results is impossible owing not only to the complexity mentioned above but also to the overlaps and associations with Roads and Works Departments within each municipality. The question, then, in comparing is what common denominator is possible for relating Departments to each other.

In order to produce results of some statistical value, the larger Municipalities only have been compared, using dollars spent per acre maintained as a common denominator. The figures are for the year 1960 and include the following Municipalities -

Scarborough	-	North York
Etobicoke	-	Metro
City	-	All others.

Before further discussion is attempted it would be well to define only for the purposes of this report, "Parks" and "Recreation".

"Parks" as it pertains to this report is the development and maintenance of parks, parkettes, playgrounds, athletic fields, rinks, arenas and recreational facilities of a diversified nature. Roadside maintenance is included to varying degrees in most Municipalities reporting.

"Recreation" as it pertains to this report is the supervision and programming of recreational activities.

It may be noted at the outset that parks as it relates to Metropolitan Toronto has a quite different connotation which will be explained more fully later.

Each area Municipality differs in its definition of Parks and Recreation, reflecting thereby an adjustment in their organization and operation patterns with the result that the two cannot be meaningfully split, for analysis purposes. In grouping all figures in a lump sum budget extreme differences are immediately apparent in the following 'per acre' figures from the chart.

Scarborough	$3,000.00
North York	5,500.00
Etobicoke	3,900.00
Metro	1,500.00
City	4,000.00
*All others	1,900.00

* Except New Toronto.

The above figures at first glance would place maintenance and development by Metropolitan Parks Department at an extreme low. However, the difference may be explained in part by the relative lack of recreation facilities in the Metropolitan Parks System.

A realistic comparison of maintenance only can be derived by excluding the value of work orders to other Departments, Winter Works, Debenture debt payments and Capital Works Programmes, - - the results then become -

Scarborough	$1,700.00
North York	3,700.00
Etobicoke	3,200.00
Metro	650.00
City	2,500.00
All others	Not Available

Metropolitan Parks here reflects two major differences from the other Municipalities:

(1) a very large Capital Development Programme is excluded (this is also true of the City).

(2) a different concept of Parks and Recreation.

It now becomes necessary to qualify the Metropolitan Parks concept of Parks and Recreation: "Parks" means grass and trees with basic facilities in some areas such as drinking water, toilet facilities and in larger areas of regional significance roads, parking lots, concessions and shelters. Metropolitan Parks own two golf courses, a Zoo and limited recreational facilities at the Toronto Island, however, these facilities do not in any way overlap on the area Municipalities.

Without taking the last mentioned per acre figures too literally it is apparent that Scarborough pay less per acre on maintenance than the others, not including Metro. However, one must consider that an arena and swimming pool are operated under private enterprise while the same facilities in Etobicoke contribute to a higher cost per acre. North York appears to have a high maintenance cost per acre but here again Etobicoke and North York are difficult to compare too closely when one operates in part as a Board and the other wholly as a Department. The conclusion that Scarborough is low in maintenance dollars per acre and North York is high is further borne out by the questionnaire where Scarborough would use additional current funds if available 50% for upgrading maintenance whereas North York would spend only 5% on maintenance and Etobicoke nil under similar circumstances. Referring still to the same figures it is interesting to note that maintenance of Parks and Recreation facilities appears to be an average of at least four times the cost of purely "Parks" by Metropolitan Parks definition.

Mention was made earlier of "overlap". It is safe to say that in general terms no overlapping occurs in the nature of facilities or services relating to either Parks or Recreation anywhere in Metropolitan Toronto.

Overlapping could occur if Metropolitan Toronto and any area Municipality were concerned with the same things in the same areas, however as already clearly stated the difference in concept precludes any conflict in interest or duplication of service to the public.

While no duplication of service or facilities to the public exists, there may be a small duplication of staff and equipment.

The benefits that would be obtained by creation of a Central Parks and Recreation Authority are hereby outlined in brief, to be individually discussed later:

(1) balancing of seasonal employment.

(2) maintenance and administration.

- (a) staff
- (b) purchasing
- (c) equipment maintenance and repair

(3) standardized levels of maintenance and development

The disadvantages that are possible:

(1) large unwieldy organization.

(2) sacrifice of area individuality.

In discussion, first, of advantages:

(1) Metropolitan Parks Department in particular is largely concerned with warm weather activities resulting in a large summer temporary staff and a small year round permanent staff. The problems arising from this are self evident, suffice it to say that a better balance of permanent to temporary and casual staff would be desirable. The Departments handling both Parks and Recreation can balance Winter and Summer activities but are still faced to varying degrees with early Spring and late Fall change over in activities. It would appear sensible to say that the larger the staff the easier this problem would be to cope with, although it will never be solved completely.

(2a) Maintenance and Administration of a large parks and Recreation system would justify a technical staff of trained personnel and thereby avoid the existing conditions where unqualified personnel are called upon as an additional part of their duties to become park experts. Certain advantages would be gained in amalgamation of such staff as the clerical. However, as this has only an indirect parks reference it need be only mentioned.

(2b) Purchasing of specialized Parks and Recreation equipment, materials and services is a difficult procedure for trained persons. For untrained persons wrong and/or inferior equipment, materials and services can result.

(2c) Parks equipment whether it is for mowing grass or for recreation is quite highly specialized and therefore requires specialized treatment. A large Department can support a staff of experts to take care not only of the specialized equipment but also the everyday trucks and rolling stock in use.

(3) Standardization of levels of maintenance can be either advantageous or disadvantageous, it is named here as advantageous insofar as equitable distribution of facilities is made with respect to the majority in Metropolitan Toronto. Too much standardization would succeed only in eliminating individuality of appearance in local areas.

Disadvantages:

(1) Organizations can become "top heavy" in an administrative sense.

(2) Creation of a Central authority for Parks and Recreation in a City of this size could lead to a loss of individuality occasioned by standard patterns and themes being used too extensively in a parks and recreation development. In many respects the persons best qualified to determine public

needs are the local administrators. Each Municipality has its individual "flavour" or value of individual expression which would tend to be lost in a large overall organization.

Limiting of local expression would represent a strong argument against wholesale amalgamation, especially when one considers that in Parks and Recreation the administrator is dealing not only in aesthetics but also a very personalized service to the public.

1960	SCARBOROUGH	NORTH YORK	ETOBICOKE	METRO	CITY	ALL OTHERS	SUMMARY Scarborough North York Etobicoke Metro City	SUMMARY All Municipalities Except New Toronto & Weston
Detail								
Salaries & Wages						The figures below represent an attempt to achieve a total gross expenditure covering the same sphere of parks & Recreation Work as in the 5 others to the left		
Maintenance	421,000.	669,000. Inc. Mem. Hall	467,000.	499,000.	2,373,000.		4,429,000.	
Administration	32,000.	95,000.	75,000.	65,000.	162,000.		429,000.	
Work Orders	Nil	152,000.	12,000.	150,000.	Deleted [illegible] with [illegible]		314,000.	
Winter Works	18,000.	95,000.	49,000.	17[illegible]000.	750,000. [illegible] 1959-60 [illegible]		1,128,000.	
Total	471,000.	1,011,000.	603,000.	890,000.	3,325,000.		6,300,000.	
Expenditures								
Maint. & Admin.	238,000.	597,000. Inc. Mem. Hall	294,000.	444,000.	1,279,000.	N.B. New Toronto is not included	2,852,000.	
Work Orders	Nil	152,000.	3,000.	100,000.	-		255,000.	
Winter Works	10,000.	1,000.	Nil all salary	39,000.	250,000.		300,000.	
Debenture Payment	152,000.	156,000.	8,000.	Nil Treasury			316,000.	
Total	400,000.	906,000.	305,000.	583,000.	1,529,000.		3,723,000.	
Capital Works								
Salaries	Nil	Nil	Nil	90,000.	Nil	East York 247,000.	90,000.	
Expenditures	Nil	Nil	Nil	354,000.	Nil	Leaside 170,000.	354,000.	
Contracts Acq. etc.	365,000.	143,000.	135,000.	850,000.	1,750,000.	Forest Hill 175,000.	3,243,000.	
						York Twp. 750,000.		
Total	365,000.	143,000.	135,000.	1,294,000.	1,750,000.	Swansea 46,000.	3,687,000.	
						Mimico 43,000.		
						Long Branch 25,000.		
Miscellaneous as Specified	Land Purchase 5,000.	50% of Weed Control 17,000.	Nil	Nil	Nil		22,000.	
GRAND TOTAL	1,241,000.	2,077,000.	1,043,000.	2,767,000.	*6,604,000.	1,456,000.	13,732,000.	15,188
Summary								
Maintenance	696,000.	1,378,000.	836,000.	1,008,000.	3,814,000.		7,732,000.	
Work Orders	Nil	304,000.	15,000.	250,000.	-		569,000.	
Winter Works	28,000.	96,000.	49,000.	215,000.	1,040,000.		1,428,000.	
Debenture Payment	152,000.	156,000.	8,000.	Nil Treasury	Nil Treasury		316,000.	
Capital Works	365,000.	143,000.	135,000.	1,394,000.	1,750,000.		3,687,000.	
GRAND TOTAL (as above)	1,241,000.	2,077,000.	1,043,000.	2,767,000.	*6,604,000.	1,456,000.	13,732,000.	
Acreage - Roadside Maint.	Nil	Nil	10	316 (Work Order)	Impossible to Estimate in Acres	-	326	326
Maintained	411	374	259	1584	1517	658	4145	4803
Not Maintained	300	40	298	1400	90	36	2128	2164
Total	711	414	567	3500	1607	794	6599	7393
					Not same type of point as Metro			
Gross Expenditure / Maintained acres	1241 / 411 = 3000./ac.	2077 / 374 = 5500./ac.	1043 / 269 = 3900./ac	2767 / 1900 = 1500./ac.	6604 / 1517 = 4000./ac.	1456 / 760 = 1900./ac.	13.732 / 4471 = 3100./ac.	15188 / 5129 = 3000./ac.
Maintenance Expenses / Maintained acres	696 / 411 = 1700./ac.	1378 / 374 = 3700./ac.	836 / 259 = 3200./ac.	1008 / 1584 = 650./ac.	3814 / 1517 = 2500./ac.	Not available	7732 / 4145 = 1900./ac.	

Notes: (1) Revenue figures are not shown here, only direct costs.

(2) An attempt was made to take the value of actual expenditures in 1960 - where this was impossible the budget figures were used as gross expenditures for 1960.

* (3) The City of Toronto figures shown herein do not reflect total costs of maintenance of their P & R system owing to Property Dept. & Works Dept. overlap. Property Dept. maintain to a great extent (unstated amount) parks, buildings while Works Dept. maintain to a great extent (also unstated amount) parks, equipment.

(4) Probably all Municipalities are low in their cost figures due to the above mentioned overlap with other Departments by the same token all acreage figures are low as well, an example being that roadside maintenance cannot be measured in acres and therefore is not stated.

(5) Discrepancies already mentioned tend to average correctly if the value of maintenance is low and so is the acreage, therefore it would be concluded that the per acre figures of Maintainance expense / Maintained acres is probably maintained acres. Reasonably accurate with the exception of the City results refer to (3) above.

Excluding Weston & New Toronto

Summary - Total Stated Parks Area in Metro [illegible]740[illegible] acres

" " " " Maintained in Metro 5200 acres

Total Gross Expenditure on Parks Recreation $15,200,000.00

CHAPTER 11
PERSONNEL DEPARTMENTS

Only the largest municipalities - Metropolitan Toronto, the City of Toronto, North York, Scarborough, and Etobicoke - have separate Personnel Departments. Their 1960 staff totalled 49, and their expenditures $308,000.00. While the nine smaller municipalities necessarily perform personnel functions, they do not use specially trained staff for this purpose.

In considering the possible effects of amalgamation upon personnel functions, it is clear that an amalgamated structure would require an efficient personnel department, if the very large municipal staff were to be properly selected, trained, promoted, etc. Indeed since the quality of an administration can only be as good as the personnel who man it, it is probably safe to say that in the long run the overall efficiency under amalgamation would be determined to a considerable extent by the personnel selection procedures used. It seems probable that an amalgamated personnel department would cost more than the five existing personnel departments combined. The benefits which such additional expenditure would bring cannot be readily measured, but it seems safe to say that an amalgamated administration could not do without them.

Whether the nine smaller municipalities which presently have no specialized personnel services, would be better off with such services, is a rather different question. Since the recognition of the need for specialized personnel services evidently tends to vary directly with the size of an organization, it may be argued that the smaller municipalities have not recognized the need for such services. As the following summary indicates, however, a unified personnel department would offer several advantages over the present system, probably resulting in an increase in efficiency.

The summary of information collected on personnel departments follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON PERSONNEL DEPARTMENTS

Separate Personnel Departments are maintained by the City of Toronto, North York, Etobicoke, Scarborough and Metropolitan Toronto.

The remaining nine area municipalities do not have separate departments responsible for the personnel function, and are excluded from the following summary.

Questions 4 and 5:

Total Number of Departments	Total Annual Salaries of Administrative Heads	Number of Deputy or Division Heads	Total Salaries of Deputy and Division Heads	Total Permanent Staff	Total Temporary Staff
5	$55,560	5	$37,603	49	Nil

Question 6:

		Total Salary Expenditure for Years 1952 - 1960
(a)	1952	$51,165
	1953	$53,976
(b)	1954	$68,867
(c)	1955	$80,899
	1956	$113,443
	1957	$146,069
	1958	$183,796
	1959	$222,909
	1960	$248,477

Question 7:

Total Permanent and Temporary Staffs for Years 1952 - 1960
14
14
18
24
32
36
45
49
49

(a) 1 Department

(b) 2 Departments

(c) 4 Departments

Question 8:

Annual Staff Increases	
1952	-
1953	-
1954	4
1955	6
1956	8
1957	4
1958	9
1959	4
1960	-

Question 8 cont'd.

Explanation for Increase in Staff: Of the increase of 35 employees, 17 were staff required for new personnel operations -- the remaining 18 increases are attributed to expanded responsibilities of Personnel Department and increased volume of work.

Question 9:

Total Expenditure for the operation of the five Personnel Departments for 1960 was $307,954.

Total Expenditure of the five Personnel Departments in 1960 for non-salary expenditures was $59,477.

Expenditure for the services of private firms in 1960 - Nil.

Question 10:

The functions performed by the various Personnel Departments are as follows:

Function	No. of Departments Involved
Recruitment & Selection	5
Pre-Employment Testing	3
Staff Adjustments, Appointments, Promotions, Reversions, Suspensions, Dismissals, etc.	5
Promotional Examinations	2
Medical Examinations	2
Central Personnel Registry	5
Control of Establishments of Strength	3
Formulation of Personnel Policies	5
Authorization of Wage Rates	2
Public Relations	1
Conducting of Appeals - United Appeal, Salvation Army, Blood Bank, etc.	1
Unemployment Insurance	2
Counselling	1
Administration of Wage & Classification Plans	5
Fair Wage Matters	1

Question 10 cont'd.

Function	Number of Departments Involved
Hospital & Medical Plans - Administration of	1
Pension Plans	1
Personnel Surveys - on matters such as wages, salaries, fringes, working conditions, etc.	5
Labour Relations Matters:	
Conducting negotiations with Unions	2
Assisting in negotiations with Unions	3
Contract Administration	5
Appearances before conciliation, labour and arbitration boards	5
Preparation of Labour Briefs	5
Processing employee grievances	5
Accident Prevention	2
Illness & Sick Pay Matters	2
Processing of Salary estimates for budget consideration	3
Advertising Job vacancies	5
Cafeteria Management	2
Workmen's Compensation	3
Credit Inquiries	5
Garnishees	2
Personnel Statistics	5

Question 11:

Three Personnel Departments indicated there was no duplication. Two Departments did not answer the question.

In the event of total amalgamation the following major changes could probably be expected.

Labour Relations

The negotiation and administration of between twenty-five and thirty collective bargaining agreements would be consolidated into approximately five collective agreements and the number of unions representing employees substantially reduced.

Such a change could only be an improvement over the present situation, which permits unions to play one municipality off against the other and would, in my opinion, result in greatly increased efficiency.

Recruitment and Selection of Staff

At the present time only four of the area municipalities and the Metropolitan Corporation operate central personnel departments. In nine of the area municipalities the departments handle their own personnel matters.

If amalgamation takes place the establishment of personnel offices in certain areas would be required, with a central control, which would permit uniform personnel practices, standards and procedures to be applied throughout the area.

This change would increase the efficiency of personnel operations.

Wage and Classification Plans

The amalgamation of the area municipalities would permit the installation of a basic wage and classification plan in those area municipalities which at present have no such plans and would enable the consolidation of existing plans. If this were done all employees in this area performing comparable work would be classified and paid the same wage or salary rates.

The installation of one basic classification and wage plan would be essential if amalgamation takes place. In my opinion, the installation of such plans for the entire area would increase efficiency.

This summary has only commented on the major probable changes since the failure of nine area municipalities to furnish any information relative to their personnel functions does not permit specific comment on the existing situation.

CHAPTER 12

PLANNING BOARDS AND COMMITTEES OF ADJUSTMENT

In 1960 Metropolitan Toronto and eight area municipalities had planning boards; four of these eight also had Committees of Adjustment for dealing with minor variances in zoning by-laws. Six of the eight local planning boards and the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board employed full-time professional staff. One additional municipality, with no planning board, employed a planning and building commissioner. The remaining four area municipalities had no planning staffs or expenditures.

The total number of employees engaged in planning and committee of adjustment activities in 1960 numbered 161; total expenditures, including remuneration of board and committee members, came to $1,137,000, equal to 75¢ per capita of Metropolitan population. In 1952 planning activities in the Metropolitan area were nearly non-existent; nine-tenths of the existing planning establishment has developed since then. Further growth of planning and committee of adjustment activities can probably be expected if urban development and re-development continue at their average rate over the past few years.

In considering the possible effects of amalgamation upon these activities, the effects on the quantity, quality, and cost of planning should be distinguished. As regards quantity, it is very probable that amalgamation would bring some increase in the total quantity of planning work performed, especially in those municipalities lacking professional staff (it should be noted however that the Metropolitan Planning Board has given considerable planning assistance to such municipalities in the past so that they are not completely deficient in this regard). As noted above, some further growth in planning activity may be expected even without amalgamation; in this regard, therefore, amalgamation might simply be expected to bring rapidly an increase in planning activity which would come more slowly without it.

With regard to the quality of planning, amalgamation would probably bring tendencies to both raise it and lower it. Tending to improve quality would be a greater ease in coordinating the aims and functions of all planning staff in the Metropolitan area, and an increased ability of the amalgamated department to employ highly qualified and specialized planners and to make full use of mechanical aids. Tending to lower the quality of planning would be certain inefficiencies which might develop due to the very large size of an

amalgamated planning department, and the likelihood that its staff would lack the intimate local knowledge and identification with local interests which present local staffs embody. Without the influence of local planning boards and councils there might be a tendency for planners to impose plans which the people of an area might not want but would find harder to resist with no local council or board to appeal to. This is of course merely the planning aspect of the general difficulty of keeping a large government close to the needs of the people.

In the case of planning however, the people to be planned for are future as well as present residents; where there is a conflict between the interests of present residents and future planning requirements, too much local control over planners may lower the quality of their plans. How these conflicting tendencies toward both higher and lower quality of planning would balance out it is impossible to say without further study.

With regard to costs, amalgamation again would probably bring tendencies to both lower and raise them. Tending to lower costs would be certain economies of scale resulting from increased division of labour and specialization and greater use of mechanical aids; reduction of any duplication which now occurs, especially duplication arising from disagreements between local and Metropolitan planning boards and staff, would also tend to lower costs. Tending to raise costs would be the above mentioned likelihood that the quantity of planning work would be increased under amalgamation, and the development of any inefficiencies due to the sheer size of an amalgamated department. Again, without further study it is impossible to say how these conflicting tendencies would balance out.

Thus while a greater quantity of planning could probably be expected under amalgamation, estimates of its quality and costs could only be made after further investigation.

The summary of information collected on planning boards and committees of adjustment follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO PLANNING BOARD OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON PLANNING BOARDS AND COMMITTEES OF ADJUSTMENT

As of the end of 1960, the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and the following eight area municipalities had planning boards:

Toronto *
North York *
Scarborough *
Etobicoke *
York
East York
Leaside
Long Branch *

(One additional planning board was established in Mimico early in 1961).

Of these eight, the five marked with an asterisk have Official Plans, and so are permitted under Ontario legislation to establish a Committee of Adjustment; these four have done so:

Toronto
North York
Scarborough
Etobicoke

Five of the eight local planning boards along with the Metropolitan Planning Board employ professionally qualified full-time staffs:

Toronto
North York
Scarborough
Etobicoke
York

In addition, in East York, a professionally qualified full-time planning staff is employed directly by Council to provide staff service to the Planning Board, which employs no staff of its own.

In Long Branch, the Welfare Officer acts as part-time Secretary of the planning board, and in Leaside the planning board's clerical work is performed by the Clerk-Treasurer's staff.

In Swansea, although there is no planning board, there is a Planning and Building Commissioner who performs certain planning functions.

The other four area municipalities - Forest Hill, Mimico, New Toronto and Weston - had no planning board, planning staff or planning expenditures as such in 1960. Certain functions of a planning nature were however performed in these municipalities by other staff members.

Committee of Adjustment staff functions are performed by the planning staffs in Etobicoke, North York and Scarborough; the City of Toronto Committee of Adjustment has its own separate staff.

The information on planning supplied in response to questions 3 to 11 of the standard questionnaire is summarized below, question by question.

QUESTION 3

TABLE I: TOTAL 1960 REMUNERATION PAID TO MEMBERS OF PLANNING BOARDS AND COMMITTEES OF ADJUSTMENT

	Members of 9 Planning Boards	Members of 4 Committees of Adjustment	Total
Area Municipalities	$26,226	$17,290	$43,516
Metro	Nil	Nil	Nil
Total	$26,226	$17,290	$43,516

QUESTION 4

TABLE 2 STAFF DIVISIONS [illegible] SEVEN PLANNING OFFICES WHO HAVE FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL STAFFS.

Type of Division	Number Encountered	Total Staff Permanent	Total Staff Temporary	Total Staff Total	Comments
Land Use Planning	4	30	1	31	the Land Use Planning Division of the Metropolitan Planning Board included in this category, contains a Drafting Section (with 6 permanent and 1 temporary employees) and a Subdivision Section (with 4 permanent employees). In some of the other departments Drafting and Subdivision are separate divisions.
Drafting	4	18	1	1[illegible]	includes 3 "Drafting" Divisions and 1 "Design, Development and Drafting" Division. See comments above on "Land Use Planning".
Committee of Adjustment	3	8	-	[illegible]	includes 2 "Committee of Adjustment" Divisions, and 1 "Zoning and Committee of Adjustment" Division. In addition, the City of Toronto Committee of Adjustment has its own staff of 5 permanent employees.
Research	2	16	7	23	includes 1 "Research" Division and 1 "Long Range Planning" Division.
Administration	2	11	-	11	includes 1 "Administration" Division, 1 "Clerical Division".
Subdivision	2	9	-	9	see comments above on "Land Use Planning".
Transportation	1	8	1	9	
Current Operations	1	5	-	5	
Projects	1	4	1	5	
Planning and Research	1	2	-	2	
Publicity	1	2	-	2	
Total - 11 types	24	113	11	124	
In addition, the following individual staff positions were encountered:					
Liaison Officer	1	1	-	1	
Architectural Control	1	1	-	1	
Staff Consultant	1	1	-	1	
To account for all staff, add.					
Administrative Heads and Deputy Heads.		11	-	11	two Deputy Heads also serve as Division Heads and have already been counted above.
and Personnel not organized into a division:		15	1	16	
Total Staff		142	12	154	

The above 142 permanent staff are in the following job classifications:

department heads and deputy heads	13	(as noted above 2 of these deputy heads also serve as division heads)
division heads and grade I planners	30	
grade II planners	18	
senior and grade I draftsmen	10	
other and unspecified draftsmen	15	
assistant secretary-treasurers and grade I clerks	6	
other and unspecified clerks	29	
miscellaneous and unspecified	21	
Total	142	

It should of course be noted that the same job classification such as "grade I planner" etc., may correspond to different job responsibilities and pay scales in different municipalities. If a single job classification system were to be introduced throughout the Metropolitan Area, some personnel would undoubtedly be reclassified; in this sense the above classification totals give an approximate picture only.

QUESTION 5

TABLE 3: PLANNING DEPARTMENT HEADS AND DEPUTY HEADS WITH THEIR SALARIES, 1960

	Number of Departments (with full-time Professional Staffs)	Administrative Heads			Deputy Heads		
		No.	Total 1960 Salaries $	Range of 1960 Salaries $	No.	Total 1960 Salaries $	Range of 1960 Salaries $
Area Municipalities	6	6	64,033	8,400 to 14,700	5	39,877	5,564 to 10,000
Metro	1	1	15,600	N/A	1	10,500	N/A
Total	7	7	79,633	8,400 to 15,600	6	50,377	5,564 to 10,500

<u>In Addition:</u>

the City of Toronto Committee of Adjustment which has its own separate staff, employs one administrative head (but no deputy head) whose salary in 1960 was $6,075;

the Planning and Building Commissioner in Swansea (where there is no planning board) received a 1960 salary of $5,760. A considerable portion of his time was evidently devoted to planning matters. He does not have a staff.

QUESTIONS 6 and 7

TABLE 4: SEVEN PLANNING DEPARTMENTS WITH FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL STAFFS - PERMANENT AND TEMPORARY STAFFS AND SALARY EXPENDITURES, 1952 - 1960.

Number of Departments and Staff totals as of December 31st each year; salaries paid during each year.

Year	Number of departments in existence	6 Local Planning Departments with Full-time Professional Staffs			Metropolitan Toronto Planning Department			Total Seven Planning Departments with Full-time Professional Staffs		
		Permanent	Temporary	Total	Permanent	Temporary	Total	Permanent	Temporary	Total
1952	3 local	16 $ 57,572	-	16 $ 57,572	-	-	-	16 $ 57,572	-	16 $ 57,572
1953	4 local	19 $ 66,673	-	19 $ 66,673	-	-	-	19 $ 66,673	-	19 $ 66,673
1954	4 local 1 metro	24 $ 76,602	-	24 $ 76,602	17 $ 51,590	1 $ 3,812	18 $ 55,402	41 $128,192	1 $ 3,812	42 $132,004
1955	4 local 1 metro	56 $154,559	-	56 $154,559	28 $102,860	5 $ 2,126	33 $104,986	84 $257,419	5 $ 2,126	89 $259,545
1956	4 local 1 metro	70 $275,389	5 $ 5,661	75 $281,050	33 $144,310	2 $ 762	35 $145,072	103 $419,699	7 $ 6,423	110 $426,122
1957	4 local 1 metro	76 $316,300	3 $ 16,623	79 $332,923	33 $163,709	3 $ 4,879	36 $168,588	109 $480,009	6 $ 21,502	115 $501,511
1958	5 local 1 metro	81 $378,210	2 $ 13,541	83 $391,751	38 $173,898	1 $ 4,864	39 $178,762	119 $552,108	3 $ 18,405	122 $570,513
1959	6 local 1 metro	89 $448,217	7 $ 16,672	96 $464,889	40 $230,206	1 $ 9,710	41 $239,916	129 $678,423	8 $ 26,382	137 $704,805
1960	6 local 1 metro	100 $520,602	6 $ 27,356	106 $547,958	42 $240,988	6 $ 11,234	48 $252,222	142 $761,590	12 $ 38,590	154 $800,180

To complete the staff and salary picture given in the preceding table, the following permanent staff and salary totals should be added, and the relationship of the grand totals to population shown:

TABLE 5: TOTAL STAFF AND SALARY EXPENDITURES, ALL PLANNING DEPARTMENTS AND COMMITTEES OF ADJUSTMENT, 1952 - 1960.

Year	7 Planning Departments with full-time Professional Staffs - from Table 4	Other Planning Staff and Salary Expenditures (Long Branch and Swansea)	Total all Planning Staff and Salary Expenditures	Committees of Adjustment (City of Toronto C. of A. only) *	Grand Total	Total Staff and Salary Expenditure per capita Metro Population
1952	16 $ 57,572	-	-	-	16 $ 57,572	.0000 14 $0.05
1953	19 $ 66,673	-	-	-	19 $ 66,673	.0000 16 $0.06
1954	42 $132,004	-	-	-	42 $132,004	.0000 34 $0.10
1955	89 $259,545	1 $ 100	90 $259,645	3 $10,559	93 $270,204	.0000 71 $0.20
1956	110 $426,122	1 $ 100	111 $426,222	3 $12,847	114 $439,069	.0000 86 $0.33
1957	115 $501,511	1 $ 100	116 $501,611	3 $14,271	119 $515,882	.0000 86 $0.37
1958	122 $570,513	1 $ 100	123 $570,613	4 $19,330	127 $589,943	.0000 89 $0.41
1959	137 $704,805	2 $5,600	139 $710,405	4 $16,439	143 $726,844	.0000 96 $0.49
1960	154 $800,180	2 $5,860	156 $806,040	5 $21,316	161 $827,356	.000105 $0.54

* Since the Committees of Adjustment in North York, Scarborough and Etobicoke did not have their own separate staffs in 1960, the staff and salary expenditures on their account are included in the totals for the planning departments with full-time professional staffs.

From the last column of Table 5 it will be seen that while total planning staff per capita increased 7½ times between 1952 and 1960, total salaries per capita increased 11 times, as the average planner's salary rose from $3,600 to over $5,100.

The significant point of course is the fact that planning was almost non-existent in the Metropolitan area in 1952, and did not really get under way until 1955-56. The extremely small per capita expenditure on planning salaries of 5¢ in 1952, should be viewed in the light of the fact that the Metropolitan area then had well over a million population, and was one of the most rapidly growing Metropolitan areas on the continent - clearly in need of a much larger planning establishment.

QUESTION 8

TABLE 6: ANNUAL INCREASES IN TOTAL STAFFS, 1952 - 1960.

Years	Metro	All other	Total (as per Table 5)
1952-53	-	3	3
1953-54	18	5	23
1954-55	15	36	51
1955-56	2	19	21
1956-57	1	4	5
1957-58	3	5	8
1958-59	2	14	16
1959-60	7	11	18
Total	48	97	145

TABLE 7: REASONS GIVEN FOR INCREASES IN TOTAL STAFFS, 1952 - 1960.

Reason	Staff Increases Accounted For					
	Metro		All Other		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Establishment of Department and bringing up to the strength required by initial work programme. (The major reorganization of the City Planning Staff following the creation of Metro is included here).	29	60%	28	29%	57	39%
Increased Permanent Staff workload, due to:						
growth of population and growth in the role of planning	8	17%	32	33%	40	28%
preparation or administration of new Official Plan	4	8%	8	8%	12	8%
specific new functions undertaken	2	4%	5	5%	7	5%
unspecified workload increase	-	-	15	16%	15	10%
Increased Temporary Staff workload, due primarily to increased survey activity	5	11%	9	9%	14	10%
Total	48	100%	97	100%	145	100%

QUESTION 9

TABLE 8: NON-SALARY, SALARY AND TOTAL OPERATING EXPENDITURES, 1960*.

	Non-Salary Expenditures				
	For Operation of Department	For Services of Private Firms etc.	Total	Salary Expenditures (from Tables 4 and 5)	Total Expenditures
	$	$	$	$	$
6 local planning departments with full-time professional staffs	101,238	62,495	163,733	547,958	711,691
Metropolitan Toronto planning department	38,055	53,833	91,888	252,222	344,110
Total seven planning departments with full-time professional staffs	139,293	116,328	255,621	800,180	1,055,801
Planning expenditures in other municipalities (Leaside, Long Branch, Swansea).	1,148	3,507	4,655	5,860	10,515
Total planning expenditures	140,441	119,835	260,276	806,040	1,066,316
Committee of Adjustment expenditures ** (City of Toronto C. of A. only)	6,129	-	6,129	21,316	27,445
Grand Total	146,570	119,835	266,405	827,356	1,093,761

* Note that these figures exclude any capital expenditures, debenture debt charges or rents paid for office space, as stipulated in the questionnaire. While with these exceptions the figures above probably give a reasonably accurate picture of all other expenditures, there were indications in some of the returned questionnaires that certain expenditures (such as employer contributions to pensions, unemployment insurance etc.) may have been omitted, and that some capital expenditures (such as equipment and furniture purchases etc.) may have been included. In preparing this summary any obvious capital expenditures which had been included in the returns were deleted.

** Since the Committees of Adjustment in North York, Scarborough and Etobicoke did not have their own separate staffs in 1960, the salary and non-salary expenditures made on their behalf are included in the totals for the planning departments with full time professional staffs.

To complete the expenditures picture, the 1960 remuneration and allowances paid to members of planning boards and committees of adjustment should be added. As noted under Question 3 above, the 1960 remuneration of board members totalled $26,226 and of committee of adjustment members $17,290. These totals are accounted for entirely by five of the six area municipalities with full-time professional planning staffs.

Adding the remuneration paid board members to the "total planning expenditures" from Table 8 gives:

$1,066,316
26,226
$1,092,542 as the grand total of all expenditures on planning. Similarly adding the remuneration paid committee of adjustment members to the "Committee of Adjustment Expenditures" from Table 8 gives:

27,445
17,290
$44,735.

The combined planning and committee of adjustment grand total then becomes

$1,092,542
44,735
$1,137,277.

This represents a 1960 expenditure per capita of Metro population of $0.75. For comparison, the per capita expenditures by municipality are given below in Table 9.

TABLE 9: PLANNING AND COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT STAFF AND ALL EXPENDITURES 1960, BY MUNICIPALITY

Municipality	Staff and Salary Expenditures	Non-Salary Expenditures	Remuneration to members of: Planning Board	Remuneration to members of: Committee of Adjustment	Total - all Expenditures	1960 Assessed Population	Per capita Expenditure
		$	$	$	$		
Municipalities with full-time professional planning staffs.							
Metropolitan Toronto	48 252,222	91,888	Nil	N/	344,110	1,527,105	$0.23
City of Toronto	42 235,500 *	69,475	60	8,040	313,075	644,948	$0.49
North York	26 127,310	36,689	9,500	5,5[illegible]	178,999	247,764	$0.72
Scarborough	17 77,543	12,869	6,610	75	97,772	198,724	$0.49
Etobicoke	17 86,260	19,975	10,000	3,000	119,235	145,847	$0.82
York	6 26,496	12,315	Nil	N/	38,811	124,195	$0.31
East York	3 16,165	18,539	56	/	34,760	69,373	0.50
Sub-total 6 area municipalities with full-time professional planning staffs	111 569,274	169,862	26,226	17,280	782,652	1,430,851	$0.55
Other Municipalities with some planning expenditures:							
Leaside	Nil	4,147	Nil	N/A	4,147	16,645	$0.25
Long Branch	1 (part time) 100	38	Nil	N/A	138	10,783	$0.01
Swansea	1 5,760 **	470	N/a	N/A	6,230	9,522	$0.65
Sub-total 3 area municipalities with some planning expenditures	2 5,860	4,655	-	-	10,515	36,950	$0.28
Other municipalities with no planning expenditures.							
Forest Hill, Mimico, New Toronto, Weston	-	-	-	-	-	59,304	-
Sub-total 13 area municipalities	113 575,134	174,517	26,226	17,[illegible]	793,167	1,527,105	$0.52
Grand total Metropolitan Toronto and all area municipalities	161 827,356	266,405	26,226	17,280	1,137,277	1,527,105	$0.75

* including Committee of Adjustment.

** the Swansea Planning and Building Commissioner does not devote all his time to planning matters; no attempt has been made to allow for this and his full salary and expenditure are given in the table, thereby overstating Swansea's planning expenditures to an unknown degree.

QUESTION 10

In summarizing planning functions, only the planning departments with full-time professional staffs lend themselves to meaningful analysis. Five of the seven departments in this category furnished percentage breakdowns by function for their total expenditures and for their board meeting time, following the standardized functional breakdown suggested in the Questionnaire appendix. * Table 10 shows this information. It is unfortunate that comparable data could not be provided for Etobicoke and Scarborough (the latter did provide a percentage breakdown, but not according to the standard list of functions). The three outer suburbs account for a third of all planning expenditures by Metro and the area municipalities combined, and differences in their expenditure patterns compared to the other municipalities might be illuminating. As it is, the one large suburb of North York for which data is available, displays certain differences which are of interest. There is however some reason to believe that the North York pattern may be rather different from Etobicoke's and Scarborough's, as noted below.

Turning from functions to workload, the large amount of information supplied on workload is unfortunately too detailed, and the workloads vary too widely among the various departments to permit summarizing.

The information on planning board meetings contained in Table 10 may be augmented however. In addition to the 98 board meetings held in 1960 by the five boards included in the tabular summary, another 93 meetings were held by the Scarborough, Etobicoke and Leaside planning boards. The four committees of adjustment in Toronto, North York, Scarborough and Etobicoke also held a total of 100 meetings to hear applications for zoning adjustments. The total number of planning board and committee of adjustment meetings during 1960 was therefore 291 or more than one meeting for every working day in the year. When it is realized that the average duration of each of these meetings is probably between two and three hours, the magnitude of the job being performed by these boards and committees becomes more evident. Clearly under an

---

* It should be noted that these breakdowns are evidently to a considerable extent "guesstimates", as the department records are generally not kept according to the functions listed. It is felt however that they probably give a reasonably accurate picture of the allocation of expenditures and board time, as they were presumably prepared by persons having full familiarity with each department.

amalgamated system, provision would have to be made for dealing with all the matters they now handle.

Returning to Table 10, it is evident that two functions took up most of the time at 1960 planning board meetings; comprehensive planning (the preparation of official plans, comprehensive official plan and zoning by-law amendments, community plans, redevelopment plans etc.) and current development control (subdivisions, routine amendments, site plans, road closings, consents to register, etc.) between them accounted for nearly 90% of total meeting time. This was more true for the four local boards (92%) than for the Metro board (60%), mainly because of the much heavier involvement of the latter in transportation matters.

Comparing the two major functions, current development control accounted for more than twice as much board time as comprehensive planning for the five boards combined, but the ratio varied widely among the individual boards; in North York it was five to one (Etobicoke and Scarborough would probably show somewhat lower ratios) and in East York heavy concentration on the preparation of an official plan reversed the ratio and gave comprehensive planning four times as much board time as development control.

These two major functions generally accounted for a smaller proportion of expenditures (and implicity of staff time) than of board time. For the five departments combined, they represented 54% of expenditures; but East York and North York at 100% and 81% respectively, stood in sharp contrast to the other three departments at 45% each. In North York, development control accounted for three times as much expenditure as comprehensive planning, as would be expected in a rapidly developing suburban municipality; again, it is likely that Etobicoke and Scarborough would show lower ratios as their workloads indicate considerable expenditures on comprehensive planning. In the City, York and Metro departments, these two functions represented nearly equal expenditures.

Research accounted for about a fifth of the Metro and City expenditures, but for only a twentieth of York's expenditures, and was not significant elsewhere; Metro and the City accounted for more than 97% of the total expenditures on research by the five departments. This is probably a reflection of the pressing need for comprehensive planning and development control in the other three municipalities, which evidently do not have sufficient resources left over for much specialized research, and to a considerable

TABLE 10: 1960 FUNCTIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL EXPENDITURES AND OF BOARD MEETING TIME REPORTED BY FIVE PLANNING DEPARTMENTS.

	Total Expenditures *							Board Meeting Time						
	Department							Department						
	5 Municipalities combined	Metropolitan Toronto	City of Toronto	York	East York	North York	4 area Municipalities combined	5 Municipalities combined	Metropolitan Toronto	City of Toronto	York	East York	North York	4 area Municipalities combined
Total expenditures or number of board meetings	$859,154	$344,110	$277,530	$38,811	$34,704	$163,999	$515,044	98	11	12	24	17	34	87
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Function														
Comprehensive planning	26	23	25	25	90	20	28	28	25	40	3	80	15	28
Current development control	28	22	20	20	10	61	33	61	35	45	92	20	73	64
Research	14	18	20	5	-		11	1	5	7	-	-		1
Public works programming and capital budgeting	2	3	2	-	-	1	1	negl.	-	1	-	-	1	negl.
Transportation matters	10	18	8	-	-		4	3	25	2	-	-		negl.
Public information	12	12	15	30	-	4	12	4	-	3	-	-	10	4
Other functions	8	4	10	20	-	14	11	3	10	2	5	-	2	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

* exclusive of remuneration paid board members, capital expenditures, rents etc.

extent rely on research data provided by the Metro department.

Similarly, transportation matters accounted for nearly a fifth of the Metro expenditures and nearly a tenth of the City's, but were insignificant elsewhere, reflecting the existence of the specialized transportation division of the Metropolitan staff (handling transportation analysis and design of all major facilities throughout Metro), and the City's concern with certain major transportation proposals.

Finally the public information function represented about an eighth of all expenditures by the five departments combined, running to nearly a third in York but only a twenty-fifth in North York, where however it represented a tenth of board meeting time.

One further item under Question 10 deserves attention: the amount of staff time spent attending various meetings. This information was provided by five planning departments as shown in Table 11.

TABLE 11: STAFF TIME SPENT AT VARIOUS MEETINGS, FIVE PLANNING DEPARTMENTS, 1960.

Planning Department	Total staff man hours spent attending meetings of: Own Planning Board	Public Hearings	Ontario Municipal Board	Other	Total
Metropolitan Toronto	240	-	175	1,025	1,440
North York	583	10	255	329	1,177
Scarborough	breakdown not supplied				453
Etobicoke	689	-	130	135	1,029
East York	85	135	75	300	595
Total					4,694

Note: There are indications that some of these figures represent only part of the full staff time spent at meetings; the picture given may therefore be an understatement.

This total of 4,694 man hours represents over two and a half man years of staff time. A considerable portion of this is spent at evening meetings of course, being in addition to regular working hours, but it is clear that meetings require a significant expenditure of staff time.

The extent to which amalgamation might reduce or increase this meeting time is impossible to gauge, but since many of these meetings are an essential part of the planning process in a democracy, it would seem that an amalgamated planning department would still have to provide for a considerable amount of staff attendance of this nature.

QUESTION 11.

Two municipalities, the City and Leaside, did not reply to the question on duplication. Two others, East York and Long Branch replied simply: "no duplication". The remaining five area municipalities and Metro replied at some length to the question, and their replies are quoted here in full:

North York:

"In our view there is very little, if any, duplication between the operations of the North York Planning Board and the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board. If there is any duplication at the present time, such duplication results from the fact that the area of responsibility and function of the two Boards are not clearly defined. A definition of responsibility and function and improved liaison between the two Boards would do much to eliminate any duplication involved. It is to be anticipated that the adoption and implementation of a Metropolitan Toronto Official Plan will be a major step in this direction".

Scarborough:

"The local Planning and Metro Planning organizations each have their separate functions to perform. These functions are closely allied and directly related, with Metro functions involving matters of Metro significance, and with the local planning function relating to detail of local significance. Each must complement and are dependent upon the other.

"There is no duplication of functions within the framework of the present Planning Legislation".

Etobicoke:

"Generally speaking there is no duplication between the work of Etobicoke and Metropolitan Toronto Planning Boards. The areas of work seems to be well defined to those of local and Metropolitan significance and both authorities limit their work to these aspects.

"There is, however, at present, one area where there seems to be a certain amount of duplication. I refer to some aspects of the work of the Land Use Division of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board. This division prepares detailed reports on local applications for rezoning and Official Plan amendments, which are then considered by the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board. They are often in fact covering similar grounds as the local planning staffs, as well as considering the compatibility of the proposal with the Draft Metropolitan Official Plan.

"I feel, however, that the extent of and work involved in these reports has been already reduced and will be reduced further at the time of finalization of the Metropolitan Official Plan and that this part of the work of the Land Use Division of Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board will become nearly automatic.

"I also feel that in an event of either total political amalgamation or centralization of the planning function no significant change in the structure of the planning processes in Metropolitan Toronto could be achieved. The physical extent of planning areas and multitude of local problems will have to be dealt with through district offices and the central office will have to maintain the planning coordination as well as the setting of broad planning policies, on similar basis as it is being done at present".

York:

"There is no duplication involved in this department's or Board's activities.

"In this respect let me say that I do not consider that time spent consulting and transferring information from one department (Metro or local) to another to enable them to discharge their duties is duplication. Such time would be spent in transferring information from one individual or section to another if all Metro and local Planning Departments were amalgamated".

Swansea:

"The only area wherein duplication appears to have been possible could be in the preparation of the Draft of The Official Plan of the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Area, so far as Swansea is concerned. It is not known how much time was spent in preparation of this draft".

Metropolitan Toronto:

"Overall a small to moderate amount of duplication. Some of this duplication serves a useful purpose in assuring that local and Metro viewpoints receive adequate consideration, and should probably be preserved even under amalgamation. The remaining "useless" duplication may be divided into two further categories: that which could theoretically be reduced or eliminated as easily without amalgamation as it could be within an amalgamated planning department; and that which could only be successfully reduced or eliminated under amalgamation.

"While it is impossible to estimate the amounts of duplication falling into each of the above three categories, it may be noted that it is only the last two categories which are really pertinent to question 11 of the questionnaire, and only the last category which is of real concern in any decision on amalgamation.

"If no amalgamation takes place, it seems likely that the existing duplication in the second category which has probably been reduced over the past few years through closer liaison among planning staffs, will be reduced still further. The more definite division of responsibilities which will result from the adoption of the Metropolitan Official Plan should speed this reduction. There is however, probably a tendency for new areas of duplication to emerge as new planning problems arise in the future, and there is no doubt an irreducible minimum amount of duplication in the second category which will always exist, either within the present federated system, or within an amalgamated planning department.

"It should be noted that amalgamation of the municipalities within Metropolitan Toronto would have no effect on any duplication existing in the functions of the Metropolitan Planning Board and those of Planning Boards in the fringe municipalities beyond Metropolitan Toronto but included in the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Area".

From the above replies, it would at first appear that there is some difference of opinion regarding existing duplication, but closer examination suggests that "duplication" has probably been given a somewhat different definition by each of the respondents, with a "narrow" definition resulting in a clear-cut "no duplication" reply, and "broader" definitions leading to admissions that some duplication exists.

Given somewhat different definitions therefore, probably all of the replies are in a sense true. The overall "average" picture which emerges from the replies would seem to be one involving a relatively small amount of duplication, part of which is necessary and useful, and the remainder of which can be expected to decrease in future, as it has already decreased in the past.

While this is a rather happy answer to the question on duplication, it is perhaps not the complete answer, for there are indications that the replies were based mainly on a consideration of duplication at the staff level, with less attention being paid to duplication involving planning boards.

In addition, there may be some tendency for observers who are enmeshed in the present planning structure to overlook or underestimate or regard as necessary, duplications which an independent observer might note as serious and unnecessary.

Where local and Metro boards and staffs become involved in detailed study and consideration of the same planning proposals or areas, and especially where they disagree and further studies and considerations ensue, the total amount of duplication involved may be very considerable.

Yet just this kind of disagreement and duplication may give a federated system of government an important long-run advantage over an amalgamated system, by assuring that local proposals receive really adequate consideration. If some of the local proposals so considered have little merit, may this perhaps be a modest price to pay for protection against the potential danger of an amalgamated system, wherein a wrong decision could more easily pass unchecked by any organized local opinion?

While this consideration of the possible positive value of duplication may be primarily a matter for political judgement, the question as to how much and what kinds of duplication exist is more a question of fact than of judgement. While the present study has indicated some answers to this question, they are answers based more on opinions than on any factual investigation; if more reliable answers are felt to be necessary before reaching a decision on amalgamation, they can only be produced through further

detailed factual investigation.

Without such further investigation, it is felt that it is impossible to say with any reliability whether amalgamation would increase, decrease or leave unchanged the present overall duplication in planning and committee of adjustment operations.

If further investigation would be required on the question of duplication, it would be even more essential on the question of overall efficiency, which involves many more considerations than the simple question of duplication. To be really useful further investigations would have to examine all the possible economies and diseconomies of scale which amalgamation might bring.

For example, a single large planning department would probably permit much greater division of labour and specialization of function than the present system, and could probably afford a much more extensive use of mechanical equipment such as calculators, card punchers and tabulators etc. (indeed, a single unified government might well justify its own computing centre to serve all departments with advanced electronic equipment). Similarly, the amalgamated department could probably afford to provide for itself many of the services now purchased from private firms. Each of these changes would be expected to increase overall efficiency to a considerable extent.

Countering their effect would probably be an increased difficulty of communicating with, organizing and coordinating the much larger department. Since area planning offices would undoubtedly have to be maintained, and since local "planning committees" similar to the present local planning boards might prove essential, the physical distribution of the amalgamated department's personnel throughout the area would perhaps be not very different from that of the present system; fully adequate "two-way" communication within such a dispersed department would be difficult to achieve.

Another notable difference would probably be evident under amalgamation: in the event of any difference in opinion between local and head office staff, or between a local planning committee and the main planning board, a decision would probably be reached and accepted much more quickly than under the present system. As noted previously, there might be a considerably greater chance of it being a wrong decision, but the decision - making process itself would probably be speeded up considerably.

How these and other economies and diseconomies of scale might balance out under amalgamation, it is impossible to estimate without much more thorough study; and even after such thorough study, only rough estimates could be attempted. They would however provide a somewhat firmer basis for a decision than is available at present.

CHAPTER 13
PROPERTY AND REAL ESTATE SERVICES

In this field only two municipalities in addition to Metropolitan Toronto have specialized departments. They are the City of Toronto, with a Property Department and a Real Estate Division, and the Township of Scarborough with a Property Department.

In 1960 the combined total staff of the three property departments and one real estate division was 568, of which 184 were temporary employees. Their combined expenditures came to over $3,000,000.

While only two of the four large area municipalities have established such specialized departments it would appear that when a municipality's property holdings and transactions reach a certain level such specialized services are advantageous. Under amalgamation the combined municipal property holdings and transactions would undoubtedly require a unified department to deal with them. Whether such a unified department would be more efficient than the present departments because of economies of scale, or less efficient because of its size and the wide dispersal of the properties it would deal with throughout the Metropolitan area, it is impossible to say without further investigation. From the comments on duplication in the following summary it would appear that duplication is probably not a serious problem at present. Since considerable growth in municipal property and real estate functions can probably be expected in the future however, the possibility of future duplication deserves consideration.

Similarly in considering possible efficiencies which an amalgamated department might enjoy through greater specialization, division of labour, and increased use of labour-saving equipment, the probable future growth in the department's workload and functions should be taken into account.

The summary of information collected on Property and Real Estate services follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO PROPERTY DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON PROPERTY AND REAL ESTATE SERVICES

The information contained herein is the result of summarizing information supplied by the City of Toronto Property Department and Real Estate Division and the Township of Scarborough Property Department. Although questionnaires were also returned by the Town of New Toronto, the Village of Long Branch and the Village of Swansea under the heading of Property Department it was subsequently determined that these areas actually had no Property Department functioning as such.

QUESTIONS:
4 and 5

	Scarborough	City of Toronto	City of Toronto Real Estate	Totals 2 plus City Real Estate
(a) Total number of local departments				
(b) Total salaries of Administrative Heads	$8,500.00	$12,000.00	$13,300.00	$33,800.00
(c) Number of Deputy or Division Heads	Nil	3	2	5
(d) Total salaries (c)	Nil	$24,629.00	$14,825.00	$39,454.00
(e) Types of Staff Divisions and number of each:				
Administration	1	1	1	3
Services	1	1	-	2
Maintenance	1	1	-	2
Architectural	-	1	-	1
Survey	1	-	-	1
Real Estate Transactions	1	-	1	2

(f) Permanent and Temporary employees in each Division by job classification:	Scarborough		City of Toronto		City of Toronto Real Estate		Totals	
	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.
Administration								
Commissioner	1		1		-		2	
Director of Real Estate	-		-		1		1	
Administrative Asst.	-		1		-		1	
Chief Clerk	-		1		1		2	
Clerk Grade I	-		5		1		6	
Clerk Grade II	-		5		5	1	10	1
Clerk Grade III	-		2	2	1		3	2
Clerk Steno Grade II	-		-		1		1	
Clerk Steno Grade III	-		-		2	1	2	1
Clerk Receptionist Grade III					1		1	
Services								
Director of Services			1				1	
Property Control Supervisor			1				1	
Property Operations Superintendent			1				1	
Property Rentals Supervisor			1				1	
Space Control Supervisor			1				1	
Property Records Supervisor			1				1	

QUESTIONS 4 and 5 cont'd.

(f) Services (cont'd)	Scarborough Perm.	Scarborough Temp.	City of Toronto Perm.	City of Toronto Temp.	City of Toronto Real Estate Perm.	City of Toronto Real Estate Temp.	Totals Perm.	Totals Temp.
Telephone Services Supervisor			1				1	
Clerk, Grade I			1				1	
Clerk, Grade II			4				4	
Clerk, Grade III			1				1	
Building Superintendent			1				1	
Property Foreman, Grade I	1		4				5	
Property Foreman, Grade II	1		2				3	
Property Forelady	1		1				2	
Cleaners, Male			21	4			21	4
Cleaners, Female			29	10			29	10
Caretakers	11		21	1			32	1
Watchmen			6				6	
Supervisor, St.Lawrence Market			1				1	
Lavatory Attendant, Male			5	5			5	5
Lavatory Attendant, Female			5	6			5	6
Information Clerks			2				2	
Council & Court Attendant			1				1	
Elevator Operators			8				8	
Courtyard Attendant			1				1	
Patrolman & Visitors' Guide			1				1	
Night Door Attendant			2				2	
Stationary Engineer, Grade I			1				1	
Stationary Engineer, Grade II			5				5	
Stationary Engineer Grade III			4				4	
Stationary Engineer, Grade IV			7				7	
Chief Telephone Operator			1				1	
Telephone Operator, Grade I			1				1	
Telephone Operator Grade II			5	1			5	1
Bath Attendant, Male			2				2	
Bath Attendant, Female			1				1	
Weighmaster, Grade I			3				3	
Handyman, Grade 2			1				1	
Chief Coal Inspector			1				1	
Labourer				1				1
Architectural								
Director of Architecture			1				1	
Architectural Assistant & Designer			1				1	
Structural Designer, Grade I			1				1	
Structural Designer, Grade II			1				1	
Chief Draftsman & Estimator			1				1	
Architectural Draftsman, Grade I			1				1	
Architectural Draftsman, Grade II			3				3	
Architectural Draftsman, Grade III			1				1	
Building Construction Inspector			2				2	
Clerk, Grade II			1				1	

QUESTIONS 4 and 5 cont'd.

(f) Survey	Scarborough Perm.	Scarborough Temp.	City of Toronto Perm.	City of Toronto Temp.	City of Toronto Real Estate Perm.	City of Toronto Real Estate Temp.	Totals Perm.	Totals Temp.
Surveyor	1						1	
Eng. Asst. Grade I	1						1	
Eng. Asst. Grade III	1						1	
Eng. Asst. Grade IV	1						1	
Eng. Asst. Grade V	1						1	
Maintenance								
Director of Maintenance			1				1	
Scheduling & Control Supervisor			1				1	
Maint. Operations Superintendent			1				1	
Central Shop & Stores Superintendent			1				1	
Project Supervisors	1		2				3	
Chief Property Inspector			1				1	
Property Inspector			1				1	
Clerk, Grade I			1				1	
Clerk, Grade II			3				3	
Clerk, Grade III			3	3			3	3
Storekeeper, Grade I			1				1	
Foreman Electrician			1				1	
Electricians			2	7			2	7
Carpenters			2	23			2	23
Painters			2	24			2	24
Steamfitters			1	5			1	5
Plumbers				7				7
Bricklayers				11				11
Sheetmetal Workers				4				4
General Maintenance Foreman			5				5	
Handyman, Grade I			3				3	
Handyman, Grade II			4				4	
Handyman, Grade III			1				1	
Truck Drivers			3				3	
Labourers	4		9	53			13	53
Utility Mechanic	1						1	
Real Estate Transactions								
Supervisor of Valuation and Negotiation					1		1	
Special Services Assistant					1		1	
Valuator & Negotiator, Grade I					3		3	
Valuator & Negotiator, Grade II					1		1	
Valuator & Negotiator, Grade III					2		2	
Property Evaluator	1						1	
Property Purchaser	1						1	
Secretary-Steno	1						1	
Stenographer	1						1	
	30	-	233	167	21	2	284	169

QUESTION 6

Total local salary expenditures for years 1952 to 1960.

Year	Scarborough Property		City of Toronto Property			City of Toronto Real Estate			T O T A L		
	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Total	Perm.	Temp.	Total	Perm.	Temp.	Total
	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$	$
1952	65,683	Nil	666,276	122,324	788,600	49,459		49,459	781,418	122,324	903,742
1953	73,235	No	709,564	101,942	811,506	52,760		52,760	835,559	101,942	937,501
1954	83,014	Temp.	707,857	120,579	828,436	67,489		67,489	858,360	120,579	978,939
1955	80,043	Emplo-	732,690	140,573	873,263	85,187	1,864	87,051	897,920	142,437	1,040,357
1956	105,024	yees	637,202	141,755	778,957	92,693	6,849	99,542	834,919	148,604	983,523
1957	126,254		640,718	89,904	730,622	100,883		100,883	867,855	89,904	957,759
1958	113,340		674,050	102,562	776,612	103,621		103,621	891,011	102,562	993,573
1959	108,864		910,646	150,118	1,060,764	93,699		93,699	1,113,209	150,118	1,263,327
1960	131,016		909,707	360,590	1,270,297	106,566	6,973	113,539	1,147,289	367,563	1,514,852

QUESTION 7

Total local staff for years 1952 to 1960

Year	Scarborough Property		City of Toronto Property			City of Toronto Real Estate			T O T A L		
	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Total	Perm.	Temp.	Total	Perm.	Temp.	Total
1952	22	No	241	125	366	15	-	15	278	125	403
1953	20	Temp.	228	115	343	18	-	18	266	115	381
1954	23	Employ-	229	68	297	18	-	18	270	68	338
1955	26	ees	218	81	299	23	½	23½	267	81½	348½
1956	34		196	62	258	23	2	25	253	64	317
1957	31		193	51	244	23	-	23	247	51	298
1958	24		215	47	262	23	-	23	262	47	309
1959	29		239	97	336	21	-	21	289	97	386
1960	30		233	167	400	21	2	23	284	169	453

QUESTION 8

(a) Total annual staff increases or decreases

Year	Scarborough	Toronto Property	Toronto Real Estate	Total
1953	-2	-23	+3	-22
1954	+3	-46	N.C.	-43
1955	+3	+2	+5½	+10½
1956	+8	-41	+1½	-31½
1957	-3	-14	-2	-19
1958	-7	+18	N.C.	+11
1959	+5	+74	-2	+77
1960	+1	+64	+2	+67

(b) Reasons for changes and increase or decrease as a result.

Re-organization and additional office space	-	+25½
Extra Work	-	+ 3½

In case of City of Toronto Property Department extent of funds available may determine use of temporary staff.

QUESTION 9

	Scarborough	Toronto Property	Toronto Real Estate	Total
(a) Total expenditures for operation of all local departments in 1960:	$ 44,332.00	$688,011.00	$4,456.00	$736,799.00
(b) Total expenditures by all local departments for services of private firms etc.	35,706.00	37,239.00	882.00	73,827.00
Grand total of all local non-salary expenditures	$ 80,038.00	$724,250.00	$5,338.00	$810,626.00

QUESTION 10

Functions encountered and number of local departments listing same and weighted average percentage of total expenditure for all local departments combined for the year 1960:

	Scarborough	City Property	City Real Estate	
Administration		1		6.8%
Services	1	1		48.82%
Architectural		1		4.6%
Maintenance	1	1		34.62%
Surveying	1			10.92%
Acquisition of Real Estate, including negotiating and valuations	1		1	31.80%
Selling of properties	1		1	

NOTE - Because Scarborough's figure is for combined sales & purchases it was necessary to provide combined total for weighted average.

Provision of Real Estate Valuations and advice on Real Estate matters for all Corporation requirements.			1	35.0%

QUESTION 10 (cont'd)

Grand total work load for each function - 1960:

Administration

City of Toronto Property Department alone listed this separately and reported that, at a cost of $129,533.00 or 6.8% of its total Department expenditures, it provided general administration including clerical and accounting services, preparation of estimates, conducting of studies and surveys for future planning of departmental activities and assisting departmental officials in interpretation of administrative procedures and operation.

Services

Scarborough at a cost of $61,607.00 or 29.19% of expenditures provides caretaking services to its Municipal Buildings. City of Toronto Property: expenditures of $1,015,695.00 or 53.5% of departmental expenditures and responsible for -

1. Providing operating space and related services including caretaking and operations staff and telephone services to all Civic departments.

2. Assisting in establishing maintenance standards for City-owned properties.

3. Renting City-owned properties not required for Civic operations.

4. Operating markets, public weigh scales and public lavatories.

Architectural

City of Toronto Property only. Expenditure of $87,247.00 or 4.6% of departmental expenditures and responsible for -

1. Estimating building construction and alteration costs for City buildings including preparation of plans.

2. Recommending Architects for design of new City buildings.

3. Preparation of specifications re: calling for tenders for building construction and analysing tenders received.

4. Supervision of construction of City buildings by independent contractors.

5. Designing and inspecting construction and alterations performed by Maintenance Division.

Surveying

Scarborough only. Operated at a cost of $23,050.00 or 10.92% of 1960 expenditures.

Responsible for making all surveys required for sewer easements, road widenings, property purchases and property sales. Do not require outside firms for this service now.

QUESTION 10 (cont'd)

Maintenance and Janitorial

	Scarborough	Toronto Property	Total
Buildings owned and occupied by Municipality and maintained by Property Department	15	63 (207) Parks Dept. buildings. Responsible for repairs only and by requisition.	78
Number of square feet therein	153,139	728,688 (554,057) Parks Bldgs.	880,827
Number of Properties owned and tenant occupied	2	140	142
Number of square feet therein	1,408	733,960	735,368
Vacant land (number of parcels rented)		72	72

Real Estate Transactions

	Scarborough	City of Toronto Real Estate	Total
(1) a. Acquisition of properties, including valuations and negotiations	174	387	561
b. Total cost of acquisition	not available	$3,796,381.00	
(2) a. Sales of properties in 1960	32	10	42
b. Total consideration paid	not available	$1,530,018.00	
(3) Provision of Real Estate valuations and advice on behalf of Corporation and certain of its Boards, Commissions, and Authorities.	not listed separately	not listed separately	

The reports re: No. 3 are included in total of reports to Administrations.

	Scarborough	City of Toronto Property Dept.	City Real Estate	Total
Reports to Administration	400	159	500	1059

Cost per Unit of work load

Acquisition of properties - City of Toronto = $184.00
Sale of properties - City of Toronto = 594.00

Unable to furnish any other figures under this heading on information available.

QUESTION 11

Re: Duplication on overlapping between local department and Metropolitan department

Township of Scarborough answered - "No Duplication".

City of Toronto Property Department
and Real Estate Division did not answer question.

NOTE: To the extent, for instance, that Metropolitan Property Department and local forces do not perform similar work in the same building there is no duplication. However, it is possible, perhaps, that there could be some overlapping if Metro and an area municipality require land in the same area.

COMPARISON BETWEEN AREA PROPERTY DEPARTMENTS & METROPOLITAN TORONTO

QUESTIONS 4 and 5			Metropolitan Toronto
(a) Total of Local Departments	-	2 plus City of Toronto Real Estate Division	1
(b) Total salaries of Administration Heads	-	$33,800.00	$11,000.00
(c) Number of Deputy or Division Heads	-	5	1
(d) Total salaries of Deputy and Division Heads	-	$39,454.00	$ 8,500.00
(e) Types of local staff divisions	-	Administration	Administration, including rentals
		Services	
		Maintenance	Maintenance
		Architectural	
		Survey	
		Real Estate Transactions	Real Estate Transactions

(f) Permanent and temporary employees by job classification

Classification	AREA DEPARTMENTS Perm.	Temp.	Total	METROPOLITAN TORONTO Perm.	Temp.	Total
Commissioner	2		2	1		1
Director of Real Estate	1		1	1		1
Administrative Ass't.	1		1	-		-
Supervisor of Valuation & Negotiation	1		1	-		-
Special Services Ass't.	1		1	-		-
Director of Services	1		1	-		-
Director of Architecture	1		1	-		-
Director of Maintenance	1		1	-		-
Surveyor	1		1	-		-
Chief Clerk	2		2	1		1
Clerks, Grade I	8		8	2		2
Clerks, Grade II	18	1	19	4		4
Clerks, Grade III	7	5	12	4		4
Valuator & Negotiator, Grade I	3		3	2		2
Valuator & Negotiator, Grade II	1		1	2		2
Valuator & Negotiator, Grade III	2		2	2		2
Property Inspector	1		1	2		2
Building Supt.	1		1	2		2
Eng. Ass't. Grade I	1		1	1		1
Eng. Ass't. Grade III	1		1	-		-
Eng. Ass't. Grade IV	1		1	-		-
Eng. Ass't. Grade V	1		1	-		-
Property Evaluator	1		1	-		-
Property Purchaser	1		1	-		-
Chief Telephone Operator	1		1	-		-
Telephone Operator Grade I	1		1	-		-
Telephone Operator Grade II	5	1	6	1		1
Telephone Operator Grade III	-		-	2		2
Elevator Operators	8		8	5		5
Property Foreman Grade I	5		5	-		-
Property Foreman Grade II	3		3	2		2
Stationary Eng. Grade I	1		1	-		-
Stationary Eng. Grade II	5		5	-		-
Stationary Eng. Grade III	4		4	-		-

QUESTIONS 4 and 5 (cont'd)

(f) Permanent and temporary employees by job classification (cont'd)

Classification	AREA DEPARTMENTS			METROPOLITAN TORONTO		
	Perm.	Temp.	Total	Perm.	Temp.	Total
Stationary Eng. Grade IV	7		7	3		3
Cleaners (Male)	21	4	25	24	13	37
Cleaners (Female)	29	10	39	16	2	18
Caretakers	32	1	33	23		23
Property Control Supervisor	1		1	-		-
Property Operations Superintendent	1		1	-		-
Property Rentals Supervisor	1		1	-		-
Property Records Supervisor	1		1	-		-
Space Control Supervisor	1		1	-		-
Telephone Services Supervisor	1		1	-		-
Architectural Ass't. & Designer	1		1	-		-
Structural Designer Grade I	1		1	-		-
Structural Designer Grade II	1		1	-		-
Chief Draftsman & Estimator	1		1	-		-
Architectural Draftsman Grade I	1		1	-		-
Architectural Draftsman Grade II	3		3	-		-
Architectural Draftsman Grade III	1		1	-		-
Building Const. Inspector	2		2	-		-
Scheduling & Control Supervisor	1		1	-		-
Maint. Operations Superintendent	1		1	-		-
Central Shop & Stores Superintendent	1		1	-		-
Project Supervisors	3		3	-		-
Chief Property Inspector	1		1	-		-
Property Forelady	2		2	-		-
Watchman	6		6	-		-
Clerk Receptionist Grade III	1		1	-		-
Clerk Steno Grade II	2		2	-		-
Clerk Steno Grade III	3	1	4	-		-
Storekeeper Grade I	1		1	-		-
Foreman Electrician	1		1	-		-
Electricians	2	7	9	-		-
Carpenter	2	23	25	-		-
Painters	2	24	26	-		-
Steamfitters	1	5	6	-		-
Plumbers	-	7	7	-		-
Bricklayers	-	11	11	-		-
Sheetmetal Workers	-	4	4	-		-
General Maintenance Foreman	5		5	-		-
Handyman Grade I	3		3	-		-
Handyman Grade II	5		5	-		-
Handyman Grade III	1		1	-		-
Truck Drivers	3		3	-		-
Labourers	13	54	67	-		-
Utility Mechanic	1		1	-		-
Supervisor St. Lawrence Market	1		1	-		-
Lavatory Attendent (Male)	5	5	10	-		-
Lavatory Attendent (Female)	5	6	11	-		-
Information Clerk	2		2	-		-
Council & Court Attendent	1		1	-		-
Courtyard Attendent	1		1	-		-
Patrolman & Visitors' Guide	1		1	-		-
Night Door Attendant	2		2	-		-
Bath Attendant (Male)	2		2	-		-
Bath Attendant (Female)	1		1	-		-
Weighmaster Grade I	3		3	-		-
Chief Coal Inspector	1		1	-		-
	284	169	453	100	15	115

QUESTION 6

Total local salary expenditure for years 1952 to 1960

Year	AREA DEPARTMENTS Perm.	Temp.	Total	METROPOLITAN TORONTO Perm.	Temp.	Total
1952	$781,418	$122,324	$903,742	$ -	$ -	$ -
1953	835,559	101,942	937,501	-	-	-
1954	858,360	120,579	978,939	-	-	-
1955	897,920	142,437	1,040,357	-	-	-
1956	834,919	148,604	983,523	-	-	-
1957	867,855	89,904	957,759	260,840	18,774	279,614
1958	891,011	102,562	993,573	332,040	24,253	356,293
1959	1,113,209	150,118	1,263,327	356,625	33,171	389,796
1960	1,147,289	367,563	1,514,852	391,736	23,554	415,290

QUESTION 7

Total local staff for years 1952 to 1960

Year	AREA DEPARTMENTS Perm.	Temp.	Total	METROPOLITAN TORONTO Perm.	Temp.	Total
1952	278	125	403	-	-	
1953	266	115	381	-	-	
1954	270	68	338	-	-	
1955	267	81½	348½	-	-	
1956	253	64	317	-	-	
1957	247	51	298	84	12	96
1958	262	47	309	93	18	111
1959	289	97	386	100	19	119
1960	284	169	453	100	15	115

QUESTION 8

(a) Total annual staff increases or decreases

Year	Local	Metropolitan Toronto
1953	- 22	--
1954	- 43	--
1955	+ 10½	--
1956	- 31½	--
1957	- 19	--
1958	+ 11	+ 15
1959	+ 77	+ 8
1960	+ 67	- 4

(b) Reason for changes

Local	Metropolitan Toronto
Re-Organization and additional office space	Re-Organization
Extra Work	Increased volume of Work
Availability of funds re: hiring of temporary employees	Number of temporary employees fluctuates as vacancies to be filled due to illness and vacation in permanent staff.

QUESTION 9

(a) Total expenditures for operation all Local Departments	=	$736,799.00	Metropolitan Toronto	=	$308,540.00
(b) Total expenditures by all Local Departments for services of private firms, etc.	=	73,827.00	Metropolitan Toronto	=	--
(c) Grand total of all Local non-salary expenditures	=	$810,626.00	Metropolitan Toronto	=	$308,540.00

QUESTION 10

Functions:

ADMINISTRATION

City of Toronto Property Department alone listed Administration separately. It provides general clerical and accounting services, prepares annual estimates and control of budget and conducts studies for future planning of departmental activities as well as assisting departmental officials in interpretation of administrative procedures and operation. The percentage of its expenditures thus accounted for is 6% or the sum of $129,533.00.

The Metropolitan Property Department in addition to the above under Administration is responsible for the inspection and rental of some 210 properties, (450,000 sq. ft. of floor space) and 10 parcels of vacant land, (as of December 1960). It also arranges for the calling of tenders and recommends letting of contracts for new construction and alterations to buildings. Assisting other Metropolitan Departments in determining their space requirements is another service provided. The rental of properties and the determining of space requirements is handled by City of Toronto Services Division and the new construction is the responsibility of Toronto Property Architectural Division.

SURVEYING

Scarborough Property Department was only one listing Surveying as a function.

ARCHITECTURAL

City of Toronto Property Department alone listed Architectural work.

SERVICES

City of Toronto listed separately a Services Division which in addition to items covered under above report on Administration operates weigh scales and lavatories and provides telephone and switchboard service in City Hall. The rental of 140 properties (733,000 sq. ft. of floor space) is under this division as well as rental of some 72 parcels of vacant land.

QUESTION 10 (cont'd)

Functions (cont'd)

MAINTENANCE

City of Toronto Property, Scarborough Property and Metropolitan Property all provide maintenance of the respective Civic buildings.

Area	Number of Buildings	Number of square feet	Cost
Scarborough	15	153,000	$ 98,000.00
Toronto	63	728,000	665,000.00
Metropolitan Toronto	25	725,000	350,000.00

Scarborough has two properties rented (1,408 sq. ft. of floor space) and responsibility is with Maintenance Division. In addition Toronto Property provides weed cutting and operates a Central Building Trades Shop.

REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS

The City of Toronto Real Estate alone divided this item into three separate headings namely:

		Cost
Acquisition of Real Estate including negotiations and preparation of valuations on behalf of Corporation and certain of its Boards, Commissions and Authorities	60%	$ 71,326.00
Sale of Real Estate as above	5%	5,944.00
Provision of Real Estate valuations and advice on behalf of Corporation and certain of its Boards, Commissions and Authorities	35%	41,607.00
		$118,877.00

At a unit cost of $184.00 City Real Estate acquired some 387 properties in 1960
At a unit cost of $594.00 City Real Estate sold 10 properties in 1960

Some 500 reports were prepared and submitted to Council.

Scarborough's Purchase and Sales Section operated at a total cost of $27,754.00

It handled the purchase of properties - in number	174
It sold properties - in number	32
It prepared reports to its Administration - numbering	400

Metropolitan Property Real Estate Section operated at a total cost of $86,850.00

The number of purchases effected in 1960 were - 325
There was only one sale during the year.

Some 600 separate valuations were made in connection with claims
Some 50 separate valuations were made of properties on behalf of other departments and reports submitted thereon.
Some 35 reports and valuations were prepared on properties comprising permanent assets or surplus lands.
Some 15 cases were defended at arbitration.
About 500 separate reports were submitted to Council or Committees, etc.

QUESTION 10 (cont'd)

Functions (cont'd)

REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS (cont'd)

The cost of the purchase of property represents approximately 60% of total expenses of the Division.
Unit cost is $160.00.

It should be noted that the 325 acquisitions is exclusive of any Subway acquisitions.

QUESTION 11

Re: Duplication on overlapping between local department and Metropolitan department

Township of Scarborough answered - "No Duplication"

City of Toronto Property Department and Real Estate Division did not answer question.

NOTE: To the extent, for instance, that Metropolitan Property Department and local forces do not perform similar work in the same building there is no duplication. However, it is possible, perhaps, that there could be some overlapping if Metro and an area municipality require land in the same area.

CHAPTER 14
ROADS FUNCTIONS

Analysis of the returned questionnaires on roads proved impractical because in several of the area municipalities roads and other functions are combined. The picture given in the following summary therefore, is based mainly on additional enquiries subsequent to the receipt of the questionnaires. While the resulting totals are approximate only it is believed that they give a reasonably accurate picture of road functions in 1960. It may be noted that a comparable picture on roads functions was arrived at independently by the Metropolitan Toronto Works Department in their summary of works and related activities (Chapter 18).

Capital expenditures have been excluded wherever possible so that maintenance costs only are included. Figures are gross, before deduction of provincial roads subsidies. In 1960 the total staff engaged on road functions in Metropolitan Toronto and the thirteen area municipalities combined was 1,422, and the total expenditures came to over twenty-three million dollars. Over 2,300 miles of roads and over 300 structures were maintained. The total sidewalk mileage maintained was not reported by eight of the area municipalities, but the figures given by the other five totalled over 1,300 miles.

In reply to the question on duplication twelve of the area municipalities indicated that there is none, while the thirteenth did not answer and the Metropolitan Roads Department indicated only minor duplication in the issuance of permits. Since each municipality (except Metropolitan Toronto) deals only with the roads within its own boundaries, a narrow definition of the word duplication would certainly indicate that only a minor amount of duplication could occur. In considering equipment, equipment maintenance, and other overhead items, however, it would seem possible that at least some of these facilities may be unnecessarily duplicated among the municipalities. If this were so then an amalgamated department might expect some savings in the purchase and maintenance of equipment, the operation of storage yards, etc. The same savings might, of course, be achieved through extension of existing inter-municipal service agreements to include a common municipal equipment pool.

Whether other economies of scale might be expected in a unified department, or whether its staff, dispersed over the whole Metropolitan area, would be too difficult to supervise efficiently, are questions which could only be answered after further investigation.

The summary of information collected on road functions follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO DEPARTMENT OF ROADS, OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON ROADS FUNCTIONS

The following summary is based to a large extent on information not contained in the questionnaires returned by the area municipalities but supplied verbally in response to additional enquiries.

Analysis of the returned questionnaires proved impractical due to the fact that no two area municipalities record their road costs and other pertinent data in compatible form, principally because road costs are bulked with other operational functions especially works.

Additional enquiries were necessary therefore to determine the approximate salary and other costs and the numbers of employees attributable to roads functions alone. This was done for 1960 only. In some cases where the information supplied verbally was still inadequate the figures have been estimated, as indicated in the summary.

The attempt was made to extract all costs other than capital applicable to maintenance and repair of roads, bridges, catch-basins, curbs, sidewalks, and for street cleaning, winter maintenance and boulevard maintenance. The flushing of streets was excluded where possible, as this is regarded as a health measure.

Overhead costs such as garage and yard operation, and sundry items such as pensions, hospitalization, Workmen's Compensation, etc., are as much a part of roads costs as wages or materials, and have been included in the Metropolitan Toronto Roads Department figures and wherever possible in the area municipalities' figures. Where certain items of this type are maintained for the municipality as a whole, however, as in the City of Toronto, it has not been possible to include them in this summary.

The Metropolitan Toronto Department of Works, in its summary, shows certain road costs which were developed independently of the figures in this Roads summary. Its summary indicates a total road costs per capita in Metropolitan Toronto of $15.19. The grand total in the following summary table of $23,362,671 gives a similar per capita figure of $15.16; it is felt that the agreement of these two independently derived totals is an indication that the picture given in this summary is probably reasonably correct.

It should be noted that all cost figures are gross costs, before the deduction of Provincial Roads Subsidies.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO

SUMMARY OF ANSWERS – AREA MUNICIPALITY QUESTIONNAIRE – ROADS FUNCTIONS – 1960
THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL ON METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS

	1 CITY OF TORONTO	2 TWP OF SCARBOROUGH	3 TWP OF EAST YORK	4 TOWN OF LEASIDE	5 TWP OF NORTH YORK	6 VILLAGE OF FOREST HILL	7 TWP OF YORK	8 TOWN OF WESTON	9 TWP OF ETOBICOKE	10 VILLAGE OF SWANSEA	11 TOWN OF MIMICO	12 TOWN OF NEW TORONTO	13 VILLAGE OF LONG BRANCH	TOTALS AREA MUNICIPALITES	METROPOLITAN ROADS DEPARTMENT	TOTALS
SALARY OF DEPARTMENT HEAD APPLICABLE TO ROADS FUNCTIONS.	6,500	4,000	2,500	1,85	4,000	1,117	2,360	3,952	6,515	1,766	2,953	1,500	3,024	42,037	14,200	56,237
MAINTENANCE COSTS –																
SALARIES AND WAGES.	3,828,886	668,058	47,109	16,332	523,746	44,253	210,416	68,729	650,248	30,782	49,256	39,433	35,872	6,213,120	1,056,477	7,269,597
"OTHER", WHICH INCLUDES ALL MATERIAL & EQUIPMENT COSTS, ETC., AND CONTRACT WORK.	3,075,202	2,541,763	276,310	17,573	3,468,985	42,810	274,979	34,844	1,545,422	23,059	42,575	34,328	38,604	11,416,454	4,676,620	16,093,074
TOTAL	6,904,088	3,209,821	323,419	33,905	3,992,731	87,063	485,395	103,573	2,195,670	53,841	91,831	73,761	74,476	17,629,574	5,733,097	23,362,671
NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES ENGAGED ON ROADS FUNCTIONS.	625	146	14		117	10	56	18	159	8	13	10	9	1,190	232	1,422
MILEAGE OF ROADS MAINTAINED.	486	460	75	25	421	31	117	14	308	13	16	15	16	2,001	306	2,307
MILEAGE OF SIDEWALKS MAINTAINED.	938	360	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	21	-	Not reported	Not reported	11	Not reported	Not reported	17	-	-	-
NUMBER OF STRUCTURES MAINTAINED.	61	42	6		11		8	-	Not reported	-	-	-	-	129	175	304
MEASURE OF DUPLICATION OF SERVICES.	Not reported but would be minor in issuance of permits	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None	None		Minor in issuance of permits	

MAINTENANCE COST PER CAPITA $15.16

SEPTEMBER 20, 1961

1. City of Toronto

There is a degree of overlapping in the seven Divisions of the Department of Public Works in respect to roads functions.

For instance, its Streets Division primary responsibility is garbage collection. However, on Wednesdays, certain of these collectors are detailed for street cleaning, which is regarded as a roads function. Similarly, in Winter, collectors are frequently assigned to snow removal and salting.

The return has been disregarded, and enquiry made of the Department, which elicited the following information:

Salaries and Wages	-	$3,828,886
Other	-	3,075,202
Total		$6,904,088

The basic roads staff is 250, but with engagement of temporary staff during the open seasons, it rises to 900. This together with garbage collectors diverted to roads functions, would average the staff out at about 625

The Commissioner of Works' salary was $18,500, and the portion of this applicable to roads functions would be assumed to be in the neighbourhood of $6,500.

Mileage of roads maintained	-	486
No. of bridges and subways maintained	-	61
Mileage of sidewalks maintained	-	938.1

It is to be noted that, as a general practice, most municipalities include boulevard maintenance as part of the roads expenditure. In the case of the City, this is a function of the Department of Parks and Recreation, and no such costs are included herein.

There is no principal duplication of services, but there would be minor instances, such as encroachments on Metropolitan roads within City.

2. Township of Scarborough

Works Department responsible for traffic engineering, street lighting, road maintenance, subdivision control, equipment, garbage collection and sewers.

All figures have been reported in total for Department.

Enquiry was made of the Township, and the following information was furnished verbally. It does not correlate, too well, with answers given to question 9, but it appears to be best information available.

Salaries and Wages	- $ 668,058
Other	- 2,541,763
	$3,209,821
No. of employees	- 146

Township advise that a great deal of construction work is undertaken out of current funds.

Commissioner of Works receives salary of $12,000, and portion applicable to roads functions can only be assumed as $4,000.

No duplication of services is reported.

Mileage of roads maintained	- 460
Mileage of sidewalks maintained	- 360
Number of bridges maintained	- 42

3. Township of East York

This Works Department includes engineering, roads, sewers, garbage, sanitation, waterworks and parks.

Salary of Commissioner of Works	- $11,410

No indication given as to portion of this salary applicable to roads function. Figure is assumed at $2,500.

Figures reported are grouped in such a way that it is impossible to obtain costs directly connected with road, sidewalk and boulevard maintenance.

Upon enquiry, it is learned that expenditures on these functions in 1960 were -

Salaries and Wages	- $ 47,109
Other	- 276,310
Total	$323,419

Considerable maintenance work is let out on contract.

One comment made is "since East York is a small municipality there is no definite division of staff in the Works Department. Men working on garbage collection, for instance, may be used on road work when garbage collections are light". Number of employees reported as generally working on the road system as 14.

Mileage of roads	- 75.1
No. of bridges	- 6

Report no duplication.

4. Town of Leaside

The Town Engineer has jurisdiction over ten functions, which includes roads.

He reports the portion of his salary applicable to roads as $1,850.

Distinctive salaries and wage costs applicable to roadway, sidewalk and boulevard maintenance are not reported, but the following has been reported verbally. "Other" costs have been reported actually.

Salaries and Wages	- $16,332
Other	- 17,573
	$33,095

It is reported that the major part of the work force is subject to change of duties according to the work requirements. The staff engaged on road, sidewalk and boulevard maintenance would average about 5.

Mileage of roads	- 29.22
Bridges	- 1

No duplication is reported.

5. Township of North York

This Department combines the functions of roads, garbage, waterworks, sewers, mechanical and building maintenance.

All data has been reported collectively.

In talking to a Township official it was learned that road and garbage costs are not segregated, and garbage collectors, when not on pick-up operations, are assigned to road maintenance work.

The 1960 salary of the Commissioner of Works was $11,183. Portion applicable to roads functions would be about $4,000.

The Township's Personnel Officer has verbally advised that the average staff engaged on road, sidewalk and boulevard maintenance is about 117 men.

The cost of wages and salaries applicable to roads functions can only be pro-rated according to information furnished. "Other" expenditures have been actually reported. These figures are as follows:

Salaries and Wages	- $ 523,746
Other	- 3,468,985
	$3,992,731

"Other" costs are high because of certain construction work being undertaken out of current funds.

Mileage of roads maintained	- 420.9
Number of bridges maintained	- 11

Report no duplication of services.

6. Village of Forest Hill

The Works Department of this Municipality attends to the functions of Hydro, water, sewers, sanitation, incineration, parks, artificial ice rinks and roads.

The 1960 salary of the Commissioner of Works was $9,800. Inasmuch as the ratio of roads to total responsibility of the Department is reported as 11.4%, the portion of this salary applicable to road, sidewalk and boulevard maintenance would, on this basis, be $1,117.

The salaries and wages for Department are reported in total. Using the ratio of 11.4%, the salary and wage figure would be as shown below. "Other" roads maintenance costs were reported actual.

Salaries and Wages	- $44,253
Other	- 42,810
	$87,063

No. of employees	- 10
Mileage of roadways	- 30.56
Mileage of sidewalks	- 20.77

Report no duplication.

7. Township of York

The Works Department of this Municipality attends to road-work, garbage collection, street cleaning, water and sewers, buildings and plumbing.

The 1960 salary of the Commissioner of Works was $12,900, but no definite indication is given as to the portion which might be applicable to roads maintenance. A pro-ration, from certain information given, would indicate that this figure could approximate $2,360.

The salaries and wages figure was reported actually, as were the "other" costs. There are -

Salaries and Wages	- $210,416
Other	- 274,979
	$485,395

The staff engaged directly on road, sidewalk and boulevard maintenance is not reported. However, the strength of the entire Department is indicated, and it would appear, by pro-ration, that the approximate number of employees so engaged would be - 56.

Mileage of roads maintained	- 117
Number of bridges maintained	- 8

No duplication of services reported.

8. Town of Weston

The Works Department of this municipality attends to roads, garbage collection, sewers and traffic.

Salary and wage figures are reported in total for Department. However, "other" costs directly related to roads are actually given.

Township advise they cannot segregate actual road wage costs as employees are shifted from one function to another in accordance with requirements of work.

Costs other than salaries and wages are shown thus -

Road Maintenance.....	$28,712	
Sidewalk maintenance and snow removal.....	4,209	
Street cleaning.....	1,923	$34,844
Total costs other than salaries and wages of Works Department.....		57,330
Ratio of one to the other.....		60.8%

To determine approximate road salary and wage costs, this ratio has been applied to salaries and wage figure supplied for entire Department.

In accordance with foregoing, figures are -

Salaries and Wages	- $ 68,729
Other	- 34,844
Total	$103,573

Approximate number of employees - 18.

Superintendent of Works' salary is $6,500, and portion of this applicable to roadwork would be approximately $3,952.

Mileage of roads maintained is reported as 14.

No duplication of services reported.

9. Township of Etobicoke

Is only area Municipality which has a distinct Roads Department. It, however, also handles garbage, traffic and equipment maintenance.

Salary of Roads Commissioner reported as $11,635. Portion applicable to distinct roads functions would be approximately $6,515.

Wages and salaries figures furnished include all Departmental functions. By verbal enquiry it is learned that 159 of the entire staff of 284 attached to Department are engaged on roads functions, or 56% of total.

Wages and salaries figure, below, represents this percentage of total expenditure on this account. "Other" expenditure figure has been calculated after talking to Township.

Wages and Salaries	- $ 650,248
Other	- 1,545,422
	$2,195,670

Mileage of roads maintained - 308

Report no duplication of services.

10. Village of Swansea

Works Department functions embrace parks, roads, sewers, garbage collection and waterworks maintenance.

Certain figures are reported in total, but percentage of total work load applicable to road functions as related to Department as a whole is shown as 29.47%.

Salary of Works Superintendent is shown as $5,994, and, using the percentage figure, the portion applicable to Roads would be $1,766.

The salaries and wages figure and "other" costs applicable to Roads are shown actually and are as follows:

Salaries and Wages	- $30,782
Other	- 23,059
	$53,841

The number of employees engaged on Roads functions, using the percentage figure, would be - 8.

Mileage of roads maintained	- 13
Mileage of sidewalks maintained	- 11

No bridges.

No duplication is reported.

11. Town of Mimico

Works Department has jurisdiction over streets, garbage collection, sewers and signs.

Salary of Superintendent of Works is $5,958, of which $2,953 would be applicable to roads functions.

Salaries and wage figure is totalled for entire Department, but percentage of roads expenditure to total for Department is reported as 49.4%. Accordingly, figure below is this percentage of the total. "Other" costs reported actually.

Salaries and Wages	- $49,256
Other	- 42,575
	$91,831

Number of Departmental employees reported in total, but, using the percentage figure, number engaged on roads functions would be 13.

Mileage of roads maintained is reported as 16.

Advise there is no duplication of services.

12. Town of New Toronto

Works Department handles street cleaning, maintenance of roads and sidewalks, garbage collection, sewer maintenance and traffic control.

The Department head, known as Director of Services, also acts as Town Treasurer and Welfare Commissioner.

His salary is $6,897, and there is no indication on return as to proportion applicable to each function. Say, $1,500 is amount applicable to roads functions.

There is no indication whatsoever as to number of employees engaged on roads functions or as to salaries and wages paid them. An enquiry of the Town Office brought a reply that the staff for this purpose would be 10 men. We were advised that total roads expenditures amounted to $73,761. The return indicates total roads expenditures, other than salaries and wages, as $34,328. It is to be assumed then, that the salaries and wage figure would be the difference, or $39,433.

On this basis figures, therefore, are -

Salaries and Wages	- $39,433
Other	- 34,328
	$73,761

No. of employees - 10

Mileage of roads maintained is reported as 15.2

Do not comment as to whether or not there is any degree of duplication. Presume there is none.

13. Village of Long Branch

Operations of Works Department involve roads, traffic, garbage collection and sewers.

Certain figures have been reported in total. However, the percentages of costs applicable to roads in relation to entire responsibility of Department are indicated, and are as follows:

Roads - reconstruction and maintenance.....	17.57%
Street sweeping.....	2.46
Sidewalks and boulevards.....	32.00
Total.....	52.03%

Salary of Works Superintendent is shown at $5,800, and using percentage shown, amount applicable to roads would be - $3,024.

Salaries and wages are shown in total for Department, and the figure below is a pro-ration. In order to determine costs applicable to roads functions, enquiry was made of Village, and it was learned all costs in respect to roads functions amounted to $74,476. In order to obtain the "other" cost figure, the wages and salaries amount has been deducted from this. Breakdown, accordingly, is -

Wages and Salaries	- $35,872
Other	- 38,604
	$74,476

Number of Departmental employees reported in total, and, using percentage figure, staff engaged on roads functions would be say, 9.

Mileage of roads maintained	- 16
Mileage of sidewalks maintained	- 17

Report no duplication of services.

14. Metropolitan Toronto

This is, of course, a distinctive Department dealing exclusively with roads functions.

The Roads Commissioner salary was $14,200

Costs were as follows:

Salaries and Wages	- $1,056,477
Other	- 4,676,620
	$5,733,097

"Other" costs are high, in relation to salaries and wages, because of extensive construction work being undertaken out of current funds and by contract.

No. of employees	- 232
Mileage of roads maintained	- 306
No. of structures maintained	- 175

No responsibility with respect to sidewalks.

There is minor duplication in the matters of permits for installations, such as encroachments.

CHAPTER 15

TRAFFIC ENGINEERING

Only five of the area municipalities and the Metropolitan Corporation have personnel exclusively assigned to Traffic Engineering. In all of the other municipalities the Works Departments perform those functions which are required.

Whether the eight smaller municipalities which presently have no specialized traffic engineering services would be better off with such services, can only be considered in the light of the needs of the motorist. The motorist who leaves a Metropolitan Road and enters a local road system is no less in need of the advantages which good traffic engineering may bring in one municipality than he is in another. Since the recognition of the need for specialized traffic engineering services evidently tends to vary directly with the size and population of a municipality, it may be argued that the smaller municipalities have not recognized the need for such services.

In 1960 the total cost of traffic engineering for Metro and the area municipalities combined (including expenditures by the eight municipalities without exclusive traffic personnel) came to about $2,350,000.

In answer to the question on duplication, ten of the area municipalities indicated that there is none, one indicated a small amount, and the remaining two did not answer. Thus, while the innumerable intersections between Metropolitan and local Roads might suggest that duplication could easily occur, liaison between the personnel involved evidently avoids overlapping.

However, effective traffic control measures are in large part dependent upon uniformity in the use of and the types of signs, signals, pavement markings and regulations. This can, of course, be accomplished in several ways.

It appears from the growth of staff and budget as shown herein, that growth of traffic engineering services is somewhat related to population

growth, since the greater staff growth has occurred in the faster growing municipalities. It may therefore be asked whether greater benefit might be derived by combining the traffic engineering facilities to permit specialization of staff and increased use of mechanical aids.

The summary of information collected on Traffic Engineering follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO TRAFFIC ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT, OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON TRAFFIC ENGINEERING

1. Of the 13 area municipalities, only 5 and the Metro Corporation have personnel assigned to Traffic Engineering exclusively. In all other municipalities, the Works Department performs those functions which are required.

Those municipalities having Traffic Engineering personnel are:

MUNICIPALITY	Dept. Head	Head of Traffic Eng. Functions	Dept.	Salary of Person in Charge of TEF
Metro	Traffic Engineer	Traffic Engineer	Traffic Engineering	$12,000
City of Toronto	Works Commissioner	Traffic Engineer	Works	$12,100
Township of North York	Traffic Co-Ordinator	Traffic Co-Ordinator	Traffic	$ 7,078
Township of Scarborough	Works Commissioner	Traffic Co-Ordinator	Works	$ 8,311
Township of Etobicoke	Roads Commissioner	Traffic Co-Ordinator	Roads	$ 7,235
Township of York	Works Commissioner	Traffic Co-Ordinator	Works	No Co-Ordinator in 1960.

Total salaries for Personnel in charge of Traffic Functions $46,724

2. Total number of persons on municipal payrolls for Traffic Engineering functions as of December 31, 1960:

MUNICIPALITY	NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES Permanent	Temporary	Total
Metro	29	1	30
City of Toronto	91	17	108
Township of North York	14	-	14
Township of Scarborough	21	-	21
Township of Etobicoke	16	-	16
Township of York	not answered		
Township of East York	"		
Town of Mimico	"		
Town of Leaside	"		
Town of New Toronto	"		
Town of Weston	"		
Village of Long Branch	"		
Village of Forest Hill	"		
Village of Swansea	"		
Total	171	18	189

3. Growth of staff for Traffic Engineering functions

MUNICIPALITY	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Metro	16	22	26	34	30	30
City of Toronto	77	87	92	96	102	108
Township of North York	-	5	5	7	12	14
Township of Scarborough	18	19	19	20	21	21
Township of Etobicoke	no information supplied					16
Township of York	"					
Township of East York	"					
Township of Mimico	"					
Town of Leaside	"					
Town of Weston	"					
Town of New Toronto	"					
Village of Long Branch	"					
Village of Forest Hill	"					
Village of Swansea	"					
Total	111	133	142	157	165	189

4. Salaries of Staff for Traffic Engineering Functions.

Municipality	1955		1956		1957		1958		1959		1960	
	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.	Perm.	Temp.
Metro	36,605.10	2,462.22	56,888.54	6,946.37	78,595.93	10,525.37	97,370.77	8,818.49	117,528.73	5,187.67	130,547.84	4,994.29
City of Toronto	203,991.88	23,365.36	224,372.41	31,435,53	236,078.00	42,921.45	269,290.66	44,897.87	227,346.54	65,549.52	303,222.21	82,015.35
Twp. of North York			18,186.73		18,596.88		24,500.32		35,546.18		50,914.20	
Twp. of Scarborough	24,225.00		26,521.00		39,625.00		55,880.00		71,236.00		86,992.00	
Twp. of Etobicoke		no information supplied									7,235.00	
Twp. of York			"									
Twp. of East York			"									
Town of Mimico			"									
Town of Leaside			"									
Town of Weston											3,645.00	
Town of New Toronto											4,300.00	
Village of Long Branch			"									
Village of Forest Hill			"									
Village of Swansea			"									
Total	264,821.98	25,827.58	325,968.68	38,381.90	372,895,81	53,446.82	447,041.75	53,716.36	451,657.45	70,737.19	586,856.25	87,009.64
	$290,649.56		$364,350.58		$426,342.63		$500,758.11		$522,394.64		$673,865.89	

5. Total Operating Budget exclusive of salaries for 1960.

MUNICIPALITY	TOTAL BUDGET
Metro	$ 806,095
City of Toronto	569,264
Township of North York	61,856
Township of Scarborough	78,529
Township of Etobicoke	72,339
Township of York	25,803
Town of Mimico	1,706
Town of Leaside	3,301
Village of Long Branch	3,500
Village of Forest Hill	4,375
Village of Swansea	not answered
Township of East York	37,950
Town of New Toronto	8,066
Town of Weston	3,259
	$1,675,043

6. Proportion of total cost for each function for 1960.

FUNCTION	MUNICIPALITY														
	Metro	Toronto	NY	SC	Etob.	York	EY	FH	Lea.	Mim.	NT	LB	Weston	SW	Total
Traffic Signals	237,258	199,451	20,410	41,000	19,677	4,742	6,500	1,459	146	636	4,200	1,000	2,692	-	539,171
Traffic Signs	192,234	256,674	56,446	43,000	27,000	7,618	18,000	1,458	1,870	1,070	1,300	1,500	2,613	-	610,783
Pavement Markings	183,286	148,232	9,916	24,500	11,000	5,750	1,500	1,458	1,285	-	600		1,599	-	389,126
Traffic Studies	46,354	55,217	4,073	8,265	2,000										115,909
Entrance Control	17,435	55,217	1,528	5,000											79,180
Traffic By-laws	7,915	55,217	509	5,000	235										68,876
Parking Meters		176,787				6,296					6,266	1,000			190,349
PXO's	99,167	7,706	3,921	18,276											129,070
Consultants Fees	85,000														85,000
R/R Crossing Protective Devices	30,805		8,610	12,734											52,149
Pension, Hospital, Furniture, Transportation	42,183		7,357	7,746	19,662	1,397	11,950								90,295
TOTAL COST TO MUNICIPALITY	941,637	954,501	112,770	165,521	79,574	25,803	37,950	4,375	3,301	1,706	12,366	3,500	6,904	-	2,349,908

7. Report on Degree of Duplication for Traffic Engineering Functions.

MUNICIPALITY	NONE	SMALL AMOUNT	MODERATE AMOUNT	CONSIDERABLE	EXPLANATION
City of Toronto	not answered				
Scarborough	x				
North York		x			When NY are contemplating any action that may affect Metro Traffic they obtain Metro Traffic's opinion in order to minimize adverse effect. We may then duplicate the study already performed by NY
Etobicoke	x				Consultation with Metro officials before doing work avoids duplication
York Township	not answered				
Mimico	x				
Leaside	x				
Long Branch	x				
Forest Hill	x				
Swansea	x				
East York	x				
New Toronto	x				
Weston	x				

CHAPTER 16

SEPARATE TREASURY DEPARTMENTS

Only five of the area municipalities and Metropolitan Toronto have separate Treasury Departments. The other eight municipalities have combined Clerk-Treasurer Departments which are dealt with in Chapter 7.

The six separate Treasury Departments of Metropolitan Toronto, Toronto, North York, Scarborough, Etobicoke, and York, had in 1960 a combined staff of 481 and combined total expenditures of over two and one-half million dollars. Roughly half of this expenditure was due to general accounting; a quarter of it was due to tax collection and related accounting; the remaining quarter was the result mainly of water revenue collection and related accounting and of other functions. Since the Metropolitan department is not involved in tax or water revenue collections, its total expenditures, representing about 15% of the grand total for all six departments, were devoted 85% to general accounting and 15% to payment of the City of Toronto for the services of the City's Central Purchasing and Stores Division and Fair Wages Officer. In the five local departments about one-fifth of their total expenditure was devoted to water revenue collection and accounting, and as water service is generally self-supporting, such expenditure should not be regarded as a tax burden.

Since the possible effects of amalgamation are discussed at some length in the following summary the only aspect requiring discussion here is the possible effect which amalgamation might have upon comprehensive financial planning and capital programming.

While these functions involve many municipal departments, treasury departments play a central role. At the present time long-range capital programming is well established at the Metropolitan level but only a few of the area municipalities have undertaken it. Really comprehensive financial planning, involving current as well as capital items, is not yet being undertaken in an organized manner. Should future requirements force the extension of these activities, the question arises whether they could be handled as well under the present system, or whether they would be more easily and adequately handled under amalgamation. At first glance it would perhaps seem

that the large amounts of comparable data necessary to carry out these functions would be easier to obtain from amalgamated departments than from the present departments; further investigation would of course be required before the likely effects of amalgamation on the performance of these functions could be estimated with any reliability.

The summary of information collected on Separate Treasury Departments follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO TREASURY DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON SEPARATE TREASURY DEPARTMENTS

The following information is in respect of the 5 area municipalities: Toronto, Etobicoke, North York, Scarborough, and York, which have a combined total area amounting to 94% of the Metropolitan Toronto area and 90% of the Metro General Assessment, and which have a separate Treasury Department.

	Local Departments	Metro
Number of Departments	5	1
Salaries of Administrative Heads as at December 31,1960	$67,332	$22,000
Number of Deputy or Division Heads (City of Toronto -4)	8	1
Salaries of Deputy or Division Heads	$80,720	$13,000

	LOCAL DEPARTMENTS			METRO		
	Permanent	Temporary	Total	Permanent	Temporary	Total
TOTAL SALARY EXPENDITURES						
1952	$1,172,945	$14,822	$1,187,767	$ -	$ -	$ -
1953	1,235,574	28,798	1,264,372	-	-	-
1954	1,319,691	34,241	1,353,932	112,826	1,448	114,274
1955	1,217,295	19,221	1,236,516	146,644	3,479	150,123
1956	1,376,486	17,290	1,393,776	169,852	1,765	171,617
1957	1,444,626	21,113	1,465,739	195,382	5,705	201,087
1958	1,564,164	26,449	1,590,613	220,287	7,911	228,198
1959	1,660,211	32,821	1,693,032	234,563	7,022	241,585
1960	1,824,669	42,635	1,867,304	244,724	7,307	252,031
TOTAL STAFF AS OF DECEMBER 31						
1952	379	6	385	-	-	-
1953	379	9	388	-	-	-
1954	332	2	334	33	-	33
1955	363	5	368	37	-	37
1956	382	1	383	47	-	47
1957	388	2	390	52	-	52
1958	389	3	392	50	-	50
1959	400	4	404	48	-	48
1960	424	6	430	51	-	51

EXPENDITURES OTHER THAN SALARIES

	1960 Local Departments	1960 Metro
Expenditures for Operation of the Departments	$350,406	$ 55,466
Expenditures for Services of Private Firms, etc.		
Audit Fees	37,180	-
Actuarial Services to Pension Funds	-	11,000
Payments to City of Toronto for share of expenditures of the City Purchasing and Stores Division and City Fair Wage Officer; preparation of payrolls & payroll cheques; tabulations, etc., of matured debenture coupons	-	81,414
TOTAL NON-SALARY EXPENDITURES	$387,586	$147,880

TOTAL ANNUAL STAFF INCREASES/DECREASES AND SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR SAME

	LOCAL DEPARTMENTS									METRO						
	1952-3	1953-4	1954-5	1955-6	1956-7	1957-8	1958-9	1959-60	Total	1954-5	1955-6	1956-7	1957-8	1958-9	1959-60	Total
INCREASES																
Assumption of new responsibilities including those transferred from other departments within the municipality	4	-	11	9	7	2	5	14	52	4	10	6	5	-	-	25
General increase in workload due to increase in population and growth of services	8	17	17	[illegible]	14	-	10	9	84	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
Filling of staff vacancies from previous year	-	6	6	-	-	-	-	3	15	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
TOTAL INCREASES	12	23	34	18	21	2	15	26	151	4	10	6	5	-	3	28
DECREASES																
Setting up by City of Toronto of separate Real Estate and Purchasing and Stores Divisions	-	77	-	-	-	-	-	-	77	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Transfer to Metro on inception of Metropolitan Licensing Commission	-	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	14	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
Transfer of Metro Real Estate Division to the Metro Property Department	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	1	7	-	-	8
Staff vacancies as compared with previous year end	9	-	-	3	-	-	3	-	15	-	-	-	-	2	-	2
TOTAL DECREASES	9	77	-	3	14	-	3	-	106	-	-	1	7	2	-	10
NET TOTAL INCREASE/DECREASE*	3	54*	34	15	7	2	12	26	45	4	10	5	2*	2*	3	18

FUNCTIONS, RELATIVE PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR EACH FUNCTION, STAFF BY JOB CLASSIFICATION (exclude Heads and Deputies), AND DEGREE OF DUPLICATION

FUNCTIONS	Number of Area Municipalities with function	LOCAL DEPARTMENTS Staff Permanent: Professional Supervisory	Clerks	Clerk-Typists	Typists	Machine operator	Cashiers	Switchboard operators	Other	Temporary: Clerks	Typists	Totals Permanent	Temporary	Weighted Average Percentage of Total Expenditure for each function	METRO STAFF (all Permanent): Professional Supervisory	Clerks	Clerk-Typists	Typists	Machine operators	Switchboard operators	Other	Total	Percentage of Total Expenditure for function	OVERALL WEIGHTED AVERAGE PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL EXPENDITURES FOR EACH FUNCTION
General Accounting	5	18	69	8	16	24	1	5	6	-	-	147	-	4%	5	25	9	4	4	1	1	49	85%	47%
Tax Collection and Accounting	5	11	61	20	5	17	14	-	-	2	4	128	6	32%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	27%
Water Revenue Collection and Accounting	3	10	37	2	3	3	5	-	37	-	-	97	-	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0%	17%
Other Functions	-	6	2	3	3	-	-	-	25	-	-	39	-	7%	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	*15%	9%
TOTALS	-	45	169	33	27	44	20	5	68	2	4	411	6	100%	5	25	9	4	4	1	1	49	100%	100%

* Payment to City of Toronto for services of Central Purchasing and Stores Division and City Fair Wage Officer.

DEGREE OF DUPLICATION

City of Toronto - Did not answer question.

Township of York - Did not answer question.

Township of North York - Replied "No duplication."

Township of Etobicoke - Replied "While similar work may be performed in Metropolitan Toronto and other area municipalities, it is not duplication but more in the nature of volume of work produced. Therefore, it is considered that little, if any, duplication exists."

Township of Scarborough - Replied Treasury Accountant and Assistant - Small amount of duplication in the area of debt charges, debt and Metro advances.
Accounts Payable Section - Small amount of duplication in the area of Metro invoices for debt charges recoverable and services performed.
Accounts Receivable Section - Small amount of duplication in the area of billing the P.W.C. for debt charges recoverable and billing Metropolitan Toronto for services performed."

Metropolitan Toronto - Reply indicated a small amount of duplication, no increase anticipated.

CONCLUSION: EFFECTS OF FULL AMALGAMATION

It is worthy of note that in the opinion of those Treasurers who answered the relative question there is little duplication of the existing functions of the Metropolitan Treasury Department and of any other Area Municipality's Treasury Department. Accordingly, it would appear that full amalgamation would not result in any significant reduction in the over-all volume of work to be performed by a single Treasury Department as compared with the workload of Treasury Departments under the existing municipal structure.

Since the organization and functions of the existing Treasury Departments vary somewhat from municipality to municipality, it is difficult to forecast the probable changes in the existing total structure which full amalgamation might be expected to bring about. Full amalgamation could result in certain existing functions of the Treasury Departments being transferred to departments other than Treasury, and/or transfer to the Treasury Department of other functions which are now only in some cases under the control of the individual Area Municipalities' Treasury Departments.

Centralization, making possible specialization of duties and increased use of mechanical methods may effect economies and an increase in effeciency but only a detailed study by properly qualified personnel could indicate what functions should be the responsibility of the Treasury Department, the extent to which it would be possible to use mechanical methods, and the resultant saving in costs and increase in effeciency to be expected. However, it should be noted that the extent of centralization possible in an area as large as the Toronto Metropolitan Area would be limited by the necessity to provide regional offices to afford residents with the local facilities to which they have become accustomed for payment of taxes, water bills etc. and enquiries with respect thereto.

CHAPTER 17
WELFARE SERVICES

Metropolitan Toronto and all the area municipalities had welfare expenditures in 1960, but only seven of the area municipalities had full-time permanent staff devoted to welfare matters.

In 1960 the full-time (permanent and temporary) staff devoted to welfare in Metropolitan Toronto and the area municipalities combined totalled over 1400. This figure includes the staff of Riverdale Hospital and four homes for the aged operated by the Metropolitan Department, along with the staff of certain institutions operated by the City Department.

The total expenditures on all welfare services by Metropolitan Toronto and the area municipalities combined came to over 20 million dollars. Of this amount over $4,800,000 went to wages and salaries. Only $168,000 was spent on non-salary administrative expenditures by all the welfare departments. Of the remaining $15,000,000 over $7,000,000 was spent in the form of welfare assistance payments by the area municipalities (the bulk of this - over $6,000,000 - was spent by the City of Toronto). It should be noted of course that 80% of the portion of welfare assistance payments approved by the Province is covered by Provincial grants. Metropolitan Toronto does not make welfare assistance payments. Of the remaining $8,000,000 about six and a half million dollars was spent by the Metropolitan Department in the provision of its various services, with most of the remainder being spent by the area municipalities in the provision of a variety of other welfare services.

From these figures it is clear that the bulk of the expenditure is due to either direct payments to welfare recipients or the costs of welfare services provided directly to those in need of them. It is also evident that the City and Metro provide the vast majority of the services; of the other municipalities only North York, Scarborough, York and Etobicoke had expenditures exceeding $100,000 in 1960. It is not known how the expenditures relate to the welfare needs in the various municipalities, but it is possible that the ratio of expenditures to needs may be lower in some areas than in others.

If this should in fact be the case, then as pointed out in the following summary, one of the main effects of amalgamation would be the necessity of bringing services throughout the Metropolitan area up to a standard level. This might be expected to add considerably to the total cost of providing welfare services.

Whether benefits to the area's inhabitants would warrant such increased expenditures would have to be very carefully considered. The related question regarding the comparative level of efficiency which might be expected in an amalgamated welfare department could not be answered without further investigation.

One additional item, which has already been discussed in Chapter 8, deserves mention again here. This is the provision of elderly persons' housing throughout the Metropolitan area, which is now the responsibility of the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Limited, a Limited Dividend Corporation administered by the Metropolitan Toronto Welfare and Housing Department, which operates and maintains the company's housing projects. In the event of either full amalgamation, or amalgamation of the Metropolitan and City Housing Authorities the question of amalgamating or keeping separate the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Limited and the City of Toronto Limited Dividend Housing Corporation Limited would arise. As noted in Chapter 8 since the two Limited Dividend Corporations deal with distinctly different types of housing, there may be no good reason for merging them, in which case amalgamation would produce no additional affect upon the welfare and housing department in this regard.

The summary of information collected on welfare services follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE AND HOUSING OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON WELFARE SERVICES

Limitations on Analysis

It has not been possible to summarize the reports as fully as requested because of the following limitations:-

(A) The questionnaires in all cases were not completed.

(B) Workloads were based on different units.

(C) Welfare services in many cases were not separate departments, but were included with other municipal functions.

All of the above prevented percentages and other comparisons.

Index to Statistical Tables

Number	Title
1	Number of Employees and Salary Figures for 1960
2	Welfare Department Salary & Wage Costs 1952-60
3	Current Expenditures of Welfare Department, 1960
4	Welfare Services Supplied in 1960
5	Metropolitan Toronto - Department of Welfare & Housing Operating Expenses - 1960
6	Metropolitan Toronto - Department of Welfare & Housing Workload - 1960
7	Comparison of Welfare Services Provided by the Area Municipalities and Metropolitan Toronto.

Comparisons of Metro Welfare and Housing Department Functions with those of the Area Municipalities

A perusal of the statements showing welfare services supplied to the public by the welfare departments will readily show that there is no duplication between the area municipalities and the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. Please refer to Table 7, to which the following explanatory comments are added:

Welfare Assistance under the General Welfare Assistance Act

This service accounts for by far the greatest expenditure of any welfare service, costing the area municipalities over $7,000,000 in 1960.

Post Sanatoria Care

This service is granted only with the approval of the medical officer of health of the area municipality concerned. Metropolitan Toronto repays the area municipality 20% of the cost, the Province repaying the other 80%. The Metropolitan Department's work is restricted to checking and passing for payment the share of the accounts paid by the area municipalities.

Hospitalization of Indigents

The area municipalities are responsible for the initial investigation, the facts being ascertained by social workers in the area municipalities. The reports are then forwarded to the Metro department for determination as to responsibility. There is no duplication here, for if the area municipalities did not make the initial investigation, the Metro Department would have to engage additional staff to do so.

Burial of Indigents

Metropolitan Toronto is responsible for indigent burials under the Anatomy Act under certain conditions, and under the Homes for the Aged Act. In both of these cases the Metro Department has the area municipality welfare department provide this service and reimburses them for same.

General

You will note from looking at Table 4 that there is great variation of welfare services provided, by the area municipalities with the City of Toronto providing the greatest number. This is mentioned because although Table 7 indicates, "yes" for an area municipality service, this service might not be available in all the area municipalities.

Comments of the Metropolitan Commissioner of Welfare and Housing on Probable Changes of Total Amalgamation.

It is believed that full amalgamation would not reduce the total costs of providing welfare services for the total Metropolitan area, but would

rather result in an increase in costs due to the following reasons:-

(1) Equal facilities would have to be established throughout the Metro area; this could mean bringing the quantity of services to the level of that provided by the City of Toronto.

(2) Present welfare administrators would be required to head the branch welfare offices, which would be necessary to establish within the Metropolitan area.

(3) There is no duplication in services at present between Metro and the area municipalities, so that with amalgamation the staffs would tend to be relocated and increased, rather than decreased.

Whether efficiency would be increased or decreased by amalgamation would depend entirely on type of organization, quality of administration, range of services, etc.

TABLE 1: AREA MUNICIPALITIES OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO
NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES AND SALARY FIGURES FOR 1960

	No. of Employees		Salary of Dept. Head	Other Salaries	Total
	Permanent	Temporary or Casual			
			$	$	$
East York	3		6,663.	8,383.	15,046.
Etobicoke	6		7,840.	19,177.	27,017.
Forest Hill		*1	-	740.	740.
Leaside		*1	-	-	-
Long Branch		*1	-	2,154.	2,154.
Mimico	1		-	4,004.	4,004.
New Toronto		*1	-	4,020.	4,020.
North York	8		7,000.	12,603.	19,603.
Scarborough	5		8,000.	13,169.	21,169.
Swansea		*1	-	-	-
Toronto	324	104	11,000.	1,420,123.	1,431,123.
Weston		*1	-	-	-
York Township	7		8,100.	22,954.	31,054.
	354	104	48,603.	1,507,327.	1,555,930.
Metropolitan Toronto	943	33	16,300.	3,241,252.	3,257,552.

* Handled part-time by other employees.

TABLE 2:

AREA MUNICIPALITIES OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO
WELFARE DEPARTMENT SALARY & WAGE COSTS

	1960		1959		1958		1957		1956		1955		1954		1953		1952	
	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$	No.	$
East York	3	15,046	3	13,398	3	12,497	3	12,260	2	8,832	2	8,438	2	8,117	2	7,764	2	7,367
Etobicoke	6	27,017	5	20,056	4	16,004	3	14,026	3	11,868	2	7,912	2	7,316	2	6,816	2	5,786
Forest Hill	P(2)	740	P	695	P	278	P	100	P	100	P	100	P	100	P	100	P	100
Leaside (1)																		
Long Branch	P	2,154	P	2,022	P	1,848	P	1,767	P	1,767	P	1,416	P	[illegible]	P	1,372	P	810
Mimico	1	4,004	1	3,900	1	3,796	1	3,796	1	5,019	1	2,473	1	2,419	1	4,004	1	3,606
New Toronto (1)	1	4,020																
North York	8	19,603	3	16,085	3	13,492	3	12,952	3	12,079	3	11,151	3	9,692	2	7,210	2	7,678
Scarborough	5	21,169	4	20,544	5	16,859	4	14,357	3	11,259	3	10,110	3	6,652	2	6,131	2	5,097
Swansea (1)																		
Toronto	428	1,431,123	433	1,414,405	444	1,322,675	402	1,091,858	407	1,040,019	390	1,020,180	431	986,731	448	1,085,438	433	1,076,661
Weston (1)																		
York Twp.	7	31,054	7	29,477	6	25,351	5	20,865	5	20,157	5	18,662	5	17,471	2	7,877	2	7,636
	459	1,555,930	456	1,520,582	466	1,412,800	421	1,171,981	424	1,111,100	406	1,080,442	447	1,039,252	459	1,126,712	444	1,114,741
Metropolitan Toronto	976	3,257,552	938	2,852,104	761	2,479,329	771	2,267,896	640	1,525,810	311	943,536	298	9 915,113				

(1) Welfare handled by Clerk's Department and no separate figures were supplied.

(2) P indicates part-time.

TABLE 3:

AREA MUNICIPALITIES OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO
1960 CURRENT EXPENDITURES OF WELFARE DEPARTMENT

	Materials & Supplies	Automotive Expenses & Car Allowances	Insurance	Convention & Travelling Expenses	Pensions	Sick Pay Grants	Unempl. Insurance	Workman's Comp.	Hospital Plan	Hire of Eqpt. & Services	Office Equip. & Repairs	Other Expenses	Total Other Than Wages
East York	186	900			1,573						282	100	3,041
Etobicoke	811			375							1,288		2,474
Forest Hill	30	(1)											30
Leaside													(2)
Long Branch													(2)
Mimico													(2)
New Toronto													(2)
North York	2,042	1,102			826						444	106	4,522
Scarborough	578	1,785		325								88	2,776
Swansea													(2)
Toronto	9,468	4,940	891	1,025	90,560(3)	4,657	6,447(3)	120	5,744(3)	1,430			125,282
Weston													(2)
York Township	1,245	1,945											3,190
	$14,360	$10,672	$891	$1,725	$92,961	$4,657	$6,447	$120	$5,744	$1,430	$2,014	$294	$141,315
Metropolitan Toronto (4)	11,368	4,819	178	1,482	6,843		162		569		1,384	389	27,194

(1) Included in salaries

(2) Current expenditures for Welfare Department included with Clerk's or administration expenditures.

(3) These figures are for the whole Department, whereas the others for Toronto cover the Administration only.

(4) Administration only.

TABLE 4:

AREA MUNICIPALITIES OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO
WELFARE SERVICES SUPPLIED IN 1960

		Welfare Assistance	Post Sanatoria Care	Hospitalization	Burial of Indigents	Nursing Homes	Indigent Homeless Men	Nursery Centres	Day Care Centres	Homemakers & Nurses Services	Special Relief	Miscell. Dental Care, Drugs & Food	Other	Total
East York	No.	251	10	151	5	HFA 48 NH 12	-	-	-	20				
	$													
Etobicoke	No.	323		173	6	HFA 75 NH 43	-	-	-	42				
	$	112,594.		1,119.	680.					6,958.	5,617.	2,007.		128,975.
Forest Hill	No.	122	1	8	2	HFA 4 NH -	-	-	-	1	11			
	$	21,621.				2,057.				48.	1,946.			25,672.
Leaside	No.	16	1	3		HFA 1 NH 8								
	$													
Long Branch	No.													
	$	6,002.	185.			31.								6,218.
Mimico	No.	96	1	28	2	HFA 10								
	$		225.		280.						56.	286.		847.
New Toronto	No.	616	1	51	8	NH 52								
	$	37,545.	162.		1,000.	4,040.	-	-	-	-				42,747.
North York	No.													
	$	374,377.	4,500.	2,708.	1,750.	28,815.	-	-	-	1,000.	6,500.	11,000.	4,438.	435,088.
Scarborough	No.	3,576	12							1,592				
	$	335,598.		43,734.							2,511.		16,022.	397,865.
Toronto *	No.	25,881	Included	9,416	582	HFA 623 NH 1,594	15,056	74,789	28,117	1,662	384	825		
	$	6,098,951.	in Welfare Services	12,734.	92,461.	274,891.	95,678.	110,044.	28,002.	121,110.	765,360.		146,255.	7,695,486.
Weston	No.													
	$	3,889.												3,889.
York Twp.	No.	434	6	88	5	15			54	41			156	
	$	199,022.												199,022.
Swansea	No.	32												
	$	4,366.												4,366.

* In addition a public Bath & Shower is maintained - No. of baths and showers in 1960 - 23,463

NOTES TO TABLE 4

(a) The information for each municipality is divided into two sections. The upper section which is preceded by "No." shows the number of cases handled or the number of applications processed during 1960. The lower section preceded by a "$" sign is the cost to the municipality for 1960, for the service provided.

(b) Where no figure is shown, there is no such service rendered or the information has not been supplied by the welfare department concerned.

(c) Under Nursing Homes, the symbols H.F.A. mean an application for admittance to a home for the aged. N.H. means an application for admittance to a nursing home.

TABLE 5: MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO
DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE & HOUSING
STATEMENT OF OPERATING EXPENSES-1960

Administrative Expenses, per Statement 3		27,194
Special Item		2,227
Realty Tax Subsidies		99,671
Hospitalization of Indigents		770,089
Post Sanatorium Care		18,787
Burial of Indigents		18,561
Transportation and Certification of Mental Patients		11,670
Children's Aid Societies - statutory payments	3,437,691	
- grants	557,463	3,995,154
Training Schools		91,197
Female Refuges		266
Riverdale Hospital		
Administration	23,012	
Food and Provisions	44,322	
Medical and Dental Services	16,963	
Maintenance and Operation	38,583	
Miscellaneous	25	122,905
Homes for the Aged		
Administration	159,602	
Special Home Care	17,790	
Food and Provisions	380,750	
Medical and Dental Services	163,732	
Funeral and Burial Expense	7,573	
Welfare of Residents	63,017	
Maintenance and Operation	385,732	
Special Items	144,370	1,322,566
Private Nursing Homes		2,432
Total Operating Expenses (excluding salaries & wages)		6,482,719

TABLE 6: THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO
DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE AND HOUSING
SUMMARY OF WORKLOAD - 1960

Homes for the Aged	
Bed capacity at four homes - December 31, 1960	1,794
Resident days	585,411
Number of pounds of linen laundered by department laundry	1,664,503
Number of prescriptions filled by department pharmacy	12,500
Riverdale Hospital	
Bed capacity, December 31, 1960	105
Patient days	30,225
Hospitalization Division	
Number of applications processed for hospital care of indigents	11,553
Child Welfare Division	
Average number of children for whom maintenance paid	3,578
Number of days care	1,222,980
Average number of children in training schools	350
Number of days care	101,330
Elderly Persons Housing	
This housing is provided by the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Limited, a limited dividend corporation. The Department of Welfare, however, is responsible for the administration, operation and maintenance of this corporation's assets.	
Number of projects in operation	7
Number of dwelling units, December 31, 1960	1,016
Rents collected	$427,000

TABLE 6: THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO
DEPARTMENT OF WELFARE AND HOUSING
SUMMARY OF WORKLOAD - 1960

Homes for the Aged	
Bed capacity at four homes - December 31, 1960	1,794
Resident days	585,411
Number of pounds of linen laundered by department laundry	1,664,503
Number of prescriptions filled by department pharmacy	12,500
Riverdale Hospital	
Bed capacity, December 31, 1960	105
Patient days	30,225
Hospitalization Division	
Number of applications processed for hospital care of indigents	11,553
Child Welfare Division	
Average number of children for whom maintenance paid	3,578
Number of days care	1,222,980
Average number of children in training schools	350
Number of days care	101,330
Elderly Persons Housing	
This housing is provided by the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Limited, a limited dividend corporation. The Department of Welfare, however, is responsible for the administration, operation and maintenance of this corporation's assets.	
Number of projects in operation	7
Number of dwelling units, December 31, 1960	1,016
Rents collected	$427,000

TABLE 7: COMPARISON OF WELFARE SERVICES PROVIDED BY THE AREA MUNICIPALITIES AND METROPOLITAN TORONTO

	Function	Area Municipalities	Metro.
(1)	Welfare Assistance under the General Welfare Assistance Act	Yes	No
(2)	Post Sanatoria Care (A)	Yes	Yes
(3)	Hospitalization of Indigents (B)	Yes	Yes
(4)	Funerals and Burial of Indigents	Yes	Yes (C)
(5)	Nursing Homes	Yes	No
(6)	Indigent Homeless Men	Yes	No
(7)	Nursery Centres	Yes	No
(8)	Day Care Centres	Yes	No
(9)	Homemakers and Nurses Services	Yes	No
(10)	Homes for the Aged	No	Yes
(11)	Liability for Neglected Children	No	Yes
(12)	Maintenance of Children in Training Schools	No	Yes
(13)	Public Hospital	No	Yes
(14)	Elderly Persons' Housing	Yes (D)	Yes

(A) Metro Department checks the accounts and repays the area municipality 20% of cost.

(B) The area municipality makes the initial investigation and the Metro Department bears the cost of hospitalization.

(C) The Metro Department pays for indigent burials only under The Anatomy Act, and the Homes for the Aged Act, other indigent burials being handled by the area municipalities.

(D) York Township only, built before Metro. established.

CHAPTER 18
WORKS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

Simple analysis of the Works questionnaires returned proved impossible due to the fact that no two works departments encompass the same number and type of functions. Several of the area municipality works departments are involved in one or more of the following functions; roads, parks, traffic, building and plumbing inspections and permits, and hydro and public utilities operations. Since these functions are either dealt with in other Chapters of this report, or in the case of Hydro have been generally excluded from the report, it is obvious that the Metropolitan Toronto Works Department had to interpolate in some cases in order to produce the summary of works activities required for this report.

It was necessary to collect a great deal of additional information from the area municipalities before the summary could be prepared. The technique adopted was to attempt to get for 1960 two comprehensive pictures; the first would present a view of the activities, staff and expenditures of all existing works departments, regardless of the fact that some of these activities such as roads, parks, traffic and buildings are also dealt with in other Chapters of this report; the second would take each function performed by any of the existing works departments and show the total staff and expenditures devoted to this function not only by works departments but also by all other departments which might be involved.

These two pictures are presented in the summary. Taking the second picture first, the grand total of all expenditures made by works and all other departments on all the functions which works departments deal with to any extent, comes to some 81 million dollars. For the first picture the total expenditure on these same functions by works departments alone, comes to some 43 million dollars, made up of approximately 25 million dollars in salaries and wages and 18 million dollars in other expenditures. The comparable staff total for all works departments combined is given as just over 6,000.

These works department totals however include considerable portions of the staff and expenditures reported in other Chapters of this report, and in addition certain expenditures on hydro and public utilities operations which

have generally been excluded from the report because they are self-sustaining. In order to eliminate any double counting between this and other chapters, it is expedient to define works as those functions not dealt with elsewhere in this report. Under such a definition some 18 million dollars of expenditures (representing works department expenditures on roads, parks, traffic and buildings) would be deducted from the 43 million dollar total of all works department expenditures, leaving some 25 million dollars as the total expenditure by all works departments on functions not covered in other chapters. The comparable reduction in staff would drop the works department total from over 6,000 to around 4,200 and their salaries to an estimated $16,000,000

It may be noted in passing that the independently derived staff and total expenditures estimates contained in the following summary, for roads, traffic and building operations, appear to be in general agreement with the figures given in the Roads, Traffic and Building Chapters.

Returning to the estimated 25 million dollars of works expenditures not covered elsewhere, it should be noted that about $9,300,000 of this is devoted to expenditures on water purification and distribution, and another $235,000 to expenditures on maintenance and operation of hydro-electric systems; as these functions are generally self-supporting, they do not represent a tax burden.

With regard to the question on duplication, the replies generally indicated that no duplication exists; a small amount of duplication was indicated in the functions of sewage collection, water distribution and traffic, with only one of the fourteen works departments indicating any duplication in each case.

Considering the possible effects of amalgamation upon works activities, it would seem probable that under amalgamation several of the functions now handled by some of the local works departments would be transferred to other departments. In particular, roads, parks, traffic and buildings activities would undoubtedly not be handled by the amalgamated works departments. This would still leave several important functions however, including sewage collection, sewage treatment, industrial waste, water distribution, water purification, garbage, and air pollution control, and the question would arise as to whether any of these might be important enough to be handled by its own separate department.

Without considerable further study of course, it is impossible to say whether an amalgamated department or departments would be expected to handle the functions of the present works departments with greater efficiency than at present.

The summary of works and related activities follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED BY THE METROPOLITAN TORONTO WORKS DEPARTMENT OF INFORMATION COLLECTED ON WORKS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

Perusal of the Questionnaires submitted revealed the impossibility of direct comparison of the various Works Departments due to the fact that no two Departments encompass the same number and type of functions. For this reason, portions of the summary, and in particular the answer to Question No. 10, are based on an analysis by function whether or not such functions are under the jurisdiction of the Works Department in all Area Municipalities.

The analysis includes the functions of Sewage Treatment, Industrial Waste Control, Water Purification, Water Storage and Pumping, and Air Pollution Control of the Metropolitan Works Department, which have no counterparts at the Area Municipality level. It also includes information obtained by this Department from Commissions which did not receive an original questionnaire, e.g. the various Public Utilities Commissions and Hydro Departments.

Question No 1 The name of the Municipality

Question No. 2 Full name of Department, Board, Commission, etc.

THIS SUMMARY COMPRISES QUESTIONNAIRES SUBMITTED BY THE FOLLOWING:

Township of East York	Works Department Water Revenue
Township of Etobicoke	Engineering and Works Departments Roads, Garbage and Traffic
Village of Forest Hill	Works Department
Town of Leaside	Works Department
Village of Long Branch	Works Department
Town of Mimico	Works Department Incinerator Board of Mimico and New Toronto
Town of New Toronto	Works Department Incinerator Board of Mimico and New Toronto
Township of North York	Engineering Department Works Department Joint Board of Management of Townships of York and North York re Joint Incinerator
Township of Scarborough	Works Department
Village of Swansea	Works Department Hydro Electric System
City of Toronto	Department of Public Works
Town of Weston	Works Department
Township of York	Department of Works
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto	Department of Works

IN ADDITION, INFORMATION WAS OBTAINED FROM THE FOLLOWING:

Township of East York	Hydro Electric Commission
Township of Etobicoke	Hydro Electric Commission

Town of Leaside	Toronto Hydro Electric System
Village of Long Branch	Etobicoke Public Utilities Commission
Town of Mimico	Public Utilities Commission
Town of New Toronto	Public Utilities Commission
Township of North York	North York Hydro Electric Commission
Township of Scarborough	Public Utilities Commission
City of Toronto	Toronto Hydro Electric System
Town of Weston	Public Utilities Commission
Township of York	Hydro Electric System

Information was also obtained from answers to questionnaires submitted in connection with other departments where such information was required to complete the analysis.

Question No. 3 — If a Board, Commission, etc., give total 1960 remuneration (including any allowances for travel and other expenses) paid to its members.

Name of Board Commission, etc.	Total 1960 Remuneration paid Members
Incinerator Board of Mimico and New Toronto	$1, 570.00
Joint Board of Management of Townships of York and North York re Joint Incinerator	Nil *

* Members of this Board are normally Council members of either or both Municipality. Councillors are paid on the basis of a regular Committee Meeting for attending Incinerator Board Meetings.

Commissions and Boards for which questionnaires were not considered, even though information therefrom is included in this summary, have not been shown in the above.

Question No. 4 Please attach an organizational chart for 1960 showing the administrative structure of the staff of the Department, Board, etc. The number of permanent and temporary (including casual) staff in each Staff Division and job classification should be indicated.

Insufficient information was submitted in the questionnaires to summarize this question as suggested. In lieu of this we show below a summary based on functions rather than named Divisions.

Function	Total Staff engaged in this function				
	Area Municipalities		Metro Toronto		
	Works Dept.	Other than Works	Works Dept.	Other than Works	Grand Total
Sewage Collection					
This includes construction (other than capital), maintenance of storm, sanitary and combined sewers (including watercourses) and operation of Sewage Pumping Stations	638	Nil	93	Nil	731
Sewage Treatment					
100% Metropolitan service	Nil	Nil	314	Nil	314
Industrial Waste					
Work in connection with this function is mainly performed by the Metropolitan Works Department, but the Townships, while not having staff definitely allocated to this work, do provide assistance when required in connection with a problem in their Municipality	Nil	Nil	6	Nil	6
Water Distribution					
This includes construction (other than capital) and maintenance of water mains and appurtenances, and water metering and billing.	565	121	67	Nil	753
Water Purification, Storage and Pumping					
100% Metropolitan service	Nil	Nil	405	Nil	405
Roads and Bridges					
This includes road and bridge construction (other than capital) maintenance and repair, street sweeping and flushing, snow removal, catchbasin maintenance and repair, and sidewalk and curb maintenance and repair.	1236	159	Nil	232	1627

Function	Total Staff engaged in this function				
	Area Municipalities		Metro Toronto		
	Works Dept.	Other than Works	Works Dept.	Other than Works	Grand Total
Garbage					
This includes collection of domestic and industrial garbage and refuse, operation and maintenance of incinerators and sanitary landfills.					
Collection	2020	113	Nil	Nil	2133
Incineration	85	Nil	Nil	Nil	85
Landfill	13.5	12	27	Nil	52.5
Total Garbage	2118.5	125	27	Nil	2270.5
Parks					
This includes operation and maintenance of parks and recreation facilities including baseball diamonds, swimming pools, artificial and natural ice rinks, arenas, playgrounds and community centres.	43	969	Nil	144	1156
Traffic					
This includes installation, maintenance and repair of signs, traffic control signals, pavement markings, traffic studies and parking meters.	136	31	Nil	29	196
Building and Plumbing Inspection					
This includes plan examination and issuing of permits, field inspection, zoning, building and plumbing by-law enforcement.	18	225.5	Nil	Nil	243.5
Air Pollution Control					
100% Metropolitan service	Nil	Nil	44	Nil	44
Hydro					
This includes the maintenance, operation and construction (other than capital) of complete Hydro Electric systems.	15	2517	Nil	Nil	2532
Miscellaneous Functions					
This includes in various Townships weed control, safety inspection, subdivision control, pest control and dog licensing and control.	58.5	14	Nil	Nil	72.5

Question No. 5 Give the full title and December 31, 1960, salary rate of the Administrative Head of the Department, Board, etc. The Deputy Head, or if there is no deputy, the Division Heads.

Area Municipalities

Name of Department	Number of Departments	Total Salary of Administrative Heads as of Dec. 31, 1960 $	Number of Deputies or Division Heads	Total Salaries of Deputies or Division Heads as of Dec. 31, 1960 $
Department of Works	12	115,943	17	150,023
Engineering Dept.	2	28,620	2	20,903
Roads, Traffic and Garbage	1	11,635	2	14,885
Incinerator Board	1	1,000	-	-
	16	157,198	21	185,811

Since the Area Municipalities include many functions performed in Metro by other than the Department of Works, there is no basis for comparison without including the Administrative heads of the other Metro Departments concerned.

Question No. 6 Give total wage and salary expenditures in each of the years 1952 to 1960 for permanent and temporary (including casual) employees of the Department, Board, etc.

Since many of the Questionnaires did not include breakdown between permanent and temporary salaries and wages, summary below shows only the total salary and wage expenditure for each year.

Year	Area Municipality Salaries and Wages paid during year $	Metro Salaries and Wages paid during year $	Total all Works Departments $
1952	3,782,965	Nil	3,782,965
1953	4,244,086	Nil	4,244,086
1954	4,776,286	2,264,167	7,040,453
1955	5,430,908	3,041,058	8,471,966
1956	6,237,919	3,198,415	9,436,334
1957	6,990,737	3,497,196	10,487,933
1958	7,795,055	3,651,031	11,446,086
1959	9,017,392	4,059,254	13,076,646
1960	20,997,520 *	4,205,821	25,203,341 *

* City of Toronto did not supply data for years other than 1960 for the following reason quoted from their answer to the questionnaire:

"Note: The operation of the Works Department was expanded at the end of 1957, to include the activities of the Streets Department, Surveying Division and Traffic Engineering, as set out in the Woods & Gordon Report. During the years 1958 and 1959 this Department has progressively assumed various functions from other Civic Departments and, therefore, comparisons are not possible."

Question No. 7 Give total number of permanent and temporary (including casual) employees of the Department, Board, etc., as of December 31st in each of the years 1952 to 1960.

Some of the replies to Questionnaires did not include a breakdown between temporary and permanent staff. For this reason the summary below shows only the total staff for each year.

In some cases, all employees on the payroll were listed as having worked in a given year even though their tenure had been as little as one week. In these cases, using the total salary as a guide, the equivalent temporary staff on an annual basis was calculated and added to the permanent staff to give the final figure.

Year	Total Area Municipality Staffs	Metro Works Department Staff	Total Staff
1952	1362	-	1362
1953	1503	-	1503
1954	1714	689	2403
1955	1767	716	2483
1956	1881	862	2743
1957	2092	910	3002
1958	2316	918	3234
1959	2289	927	3216
1960	5122 *	949	6071 *

* City of Toronto did not supply data for years other than 1960 - see previous page.

Question No. 8 Explain any Increases or Decreases from year to year in the total staff given in your answer to the previous question.

Year	Staff increases Area Municipalities	Most frequent reason for increase	Staff increase Metro Works Department	Reason for increase	Total Staff Increase
1952-53	+141	Rapid growth resulting in increased workload	-	-	+141 *
1953-54	+211	Despite decreases in some Municipalities due to formation of Metro, rapid expansion in the larger Townships gave an overall increase	-	-	+211 *
1954-55	+ 53	Rapid growth resulting in increased workload	+27	Re-organization and increased workload following transfer of basic staff from Area Municipalities	+ 80 *
1955-56	+114	Increased workload	+146	Increased Water Purification and Sewage Treatment facilities; speed-up of Capital Works construction; assumption of Air Pollution Control	+260 *
1956-57	+211	Increased workload	+48	Operation of new Water Works facilities	+259 *
1957-58	+224	Increased workload plus winter works	+ 8	Increased Air Pollution Control workload	+232 *
1958-59	- 27	Decrease in rate of development	+ 9	Partial operation of new Humber Sewage Treatment plant	- 18 *
1959-60	- 33	Decreased in rate of development	+ 22	Humber Sewage Treatment Plant placed in full operation, required large increase in staff which was offset for the most part by removal of smaller plants from service	- 11 *
"	+2833	Net increase on addition of City of Toronto Works forces reported for this year only	-	-	+2855

* Does not include City of Toronto forces.

Question No. 9 Give the 1960 current expenditures for operation of the Department, Board, etc., other than wages and salaries. Indicate separately any expenditure for services performed by private firms or organizations outside the municipal structure (e.g. service contracts, consulting services, etc.) Do not include any capital expenditures, debenture debt charges, or rents paid for office space, etc.

In many cases the answers to the Questionnaire did not provide suitable information for proper summary. Additional information obtained wherever possible has been used to provide the figures below. For some Municipalities differences between reported total expenditure and total salaries were used to calculate the non-salary expenditures. Where breakdown was not provided, all expenditures were shown as being departmental rather than including the services of private firms, etc.

	Expenditures for operation of Department other than salaries and wages. $	Expenditure for services of private firms etc. $	Total expenditure other than salaries and wages $
* Area Municipality Works Departments	10,900,192	2,972,144	13,872,336
Metro Works Department	4,200,901	266,453	4,467,354
Total	15,101,093	3,238,597	18,339,690

* For the City of Toronto only net expenditures were supplied and are included in the above. In all other cases revenue was not considered.

Question No. 10 Describe each of the functions in 1960 of the Department, Board, etc.

The following functions were listed as being performed by one or more Departments of Works of the Area Municipalities or by Metro. Under the heading "Miscellaneous Functions" are included such minor functions as weed, fly and rodent control, dog licensing, trench safety and subdivision control.

Function	Number of Area Departments performing this function	Metro Works Department
Sewage Collection	13	1
Sewage Treatment	-	1
Industrial Waste Control	-	1
Water Distribution	9	1
Water Purification etc.	-	1
Roads and Bridges	12	-
Garbage Collection	12	-
Garbage Incineration	8	-
Sanitary Landfill	9	1
Parks	4	-
Traffic	11	-
Building and Plumbing Inspection	4	-
Air Pollution Control	-	1
Hydro	1	-
Miscellaneous	6	-

The following is an analysis of replies to the Questionnaires and additional information obtained by function.

As shown above, some of the functions listed are not under the jurisdiction of Works Departments in all Municipalities. For completeness of the summary, however, each has been analyzed both as a portion of the total of all Works Departments and as a portion of the total of all comparable Departments whether or not included under Works jurisdiction.

Sewage Collection

This includes construction (other than capital) and maintenance of storm, sanitary and combined sewers (including watercourses) and operation of Sewage Pumping Stations.

Sewage Collection is performed as a Works Department function in all 13 Area Municipalities and in Metro. There are 3002.6 miles of sewers in the Metro area and 101 Sewage Pumping Stations; of these 117.4 miles of sewers and 6 Pumping Stations are under Metropolitan jurisdiction.

In 1960 the total expenditure on this function was $3,411,204 being $2.21 per capita. This expenditure represents 7.92% of the total expenditure of all Works Departments and 4.17% of the total expenditure for all functions considered.

Sewage Treatment

This includes the operation and maintenance of 12 Sewage Treatment Plants and is a 100% Metropolitan function.

In 1960 the total expenditure on this function was $2,447,222 being $1.59 per capita. This represents 27.05% of the total expenditure of the Metropolitan Works Department and 5.68% of the total expenditure of all Works Departments in 1960. It also represents 2.99% of the total expenditure for all functions considered.

Industrial Waste

This function includes the investigation and control of all wastes discharged by industry into the public sewerage system of the entire Metropolitan area, It also covers boundary waters, watercourses and the lakefront.

Work in connection with this function is mainly performed by the Metropolitan Works Department, but the Area Municipalities, while not having staff definitely allocated to this work, do provide assistance when required in connection with a problem in their Municipality.

The total 1960 expenditure on this function was $23,365 being 2 cents per capita representing 0.26% of the total expenditure for the Metropolitan Works Department, 0.05% of the total expenditure of all Works Departments and 0.03% of the total expenditure for all functions considered.

Water Distribution

This includes construction (other than capital) and maintenance of water mains and appurtenances, water metering and billing.

In four of the Area Municipalities this function is performed by a Public Utilities Commission separate from the Works Department. The staff and other expenditure in connection with water metering and water billing are in some cases under the jurisdiction of Clerks or Treasury Departments, but the data therefore has been included in this summary for comparative purposes. The Metropolitan expenditures for water distribution include the sum of $338,029 for payment for capital works from current funds. The total miles of watermains in the Metropolitan area in 1960 was 2060.4 of which 210.2 were under Metropolitan jurisdiction.

In 1960 the total expenditure on this function was $5,551,798 of which $4,640,657 was expended by Works Departments, the balance being under the jurisdiction of Public Utilities Commissions. The total expenditure represents $3.60 per capita and the total Works expenditure $3.01 per capita. The total Works Department expenditure represents 10.78% of the total of all Works Department expenditures. The total expenditure represents 6.78% of the total of all functions considered.

Water Purification, Storage and Pumping

This function includes the operation and maintenance of Treatment Plants, Water Pumping Stations, ground level reservoirs and overhead tanks, and is a 100% Metropolitan function.

The total expenditure on this function in 1960 was $4,658,311 being $3.02 per capita. This expenditure represents 51.49% of the total expenditure of the Metropolitan Works Department. It also represents 10.82% of the total expenditure of all Works Departments and 5.69% of the total expenditure of all functions considered.

Roads and Bridges

This includes construction (other than capital), maintenance and repair of roads, bridges, catchbasins, curbs and sidewalks; street sweeping and flushing and snow removal.

This is a Works function in all but one of the Area Municipalities. It is also a separate function from Works in Metropolitan Toronto.

For the purpose of this report, only total staff and total expenditures have been considered with relation to roads and bridges.

The total expenditure in 1960 by Works Departments was $15,705,583 being $10.19 per capita. This expenditure was 36.47% of the total expenditure of all Works Departments. The total expenditure on this function was $23,398,412 being $15.19 per capita. This expenditure represents 28.59% of the total expenditure of all functions considered. (In some cases the cost of street lighting is included in the Roads expenditure, whereas in other cases it is included in other functions.)

Garbage

This includes collection of domestic and industrial garbage and refuse, operation and maintenance of incinerators and sanitary landfills.

This function has been subdivided into collection, incineration and landfill for ease of comparison, and is a Works Department function in all except one of the Area Municipalities. There is no comparable Metropolitan function except in the field of sanitary landfill.

Collection

This function is performed by the Works Departments of 12 Area Municipalities and by a separate Department in the thirteenth. The total Works Department expenditure on this function in 1960 was $7,369,399 being $4.78 per capita, and representing 17.11% of the total expenditure for all Works Departments. The total expenditure in 1960 was $8,117,810 being $5.27 per capita and representing 9.92% of the total expenditure on all functions considered.

Incineration

This function is performed by the Works Department of 8 Area Municipalities, in two cases with Joint Boards of Management. The total 1960 expenditure was $1,475,830 being 96 cents per capita and representing 3.43% of the total expenditure for all Works Departments and 1.80% of the total expenditure for all functions considered.

Sanitary Landfill

This function is performed as a Works Department function in 9 Area Municipalities and in Metro, and by a separate Department in one additional Area Municipality. The total Works Department expenditure in 1960 was $574,105 being 37 cents per capita. This expenditure represents 1.33% of the total of all Works Department expenditures. The total expenditure on this function in 1960 was $655,103 being 43 cents per capita and representing 0.80% of the total expenditure on all functions considered.

Parks

This includes operation and maintenance of parks and recreation facilities including baseball diamonds, swimming pools, artificial and natural ice rinks, arenas, playgrounds and community centres.

This is a Works Department function in four of the Area Municipalities and is performed by a separate Department in the others and in Metro. The total Works Department expenditure on this function in 1960 was $365,455 which was 24 cents per capita and represents 0.85% of the total expenditure for all Works Departments. The total expenditure on

this function in 1960 was $8,611,819 being $5.59 per capita, representing 10.52% of the total expenditure for all functions considered.

Traffic

This includes installation, maintenance and repair of signs and traffic control signals, pavement markings, traffic studies and parking meters.

Traffic is a Works Department function in all but two of the Area Municipalities and in Metro. In two cases the cost of street lighting has been included.

The total Works Department expenditure in 1960 was $1,440,946 or 94 cents per capita. This was 3.35% of the total expenditure for all Works Departments. The total expenditure on this function in 1960 was $2,813,959 or $1.83 per capita being 3.44% of the total expenditure for all functions considered.

Building and Plumbing Inspection

This includes plan examination and issuing of permits, field inspection and zoning, building and plumbing by-law enforcement.

This is a Works function in only four Area Municipalities and there is no comparable Metro function. Also in some smaller Municipalities the cost of such work is included in general administration expenditures and cannot be extracted therefrom.

In 1960 the total Works Department expenditure on this item was $99,375 or 6 cents per capita. This represents 0.23% of the total expenditure for all Works Departments. The total 1960 expenditure on this function was $1,405,288 being 91 cents per capita and representing 1.72% of the total expenditure for all functions considered.

Air Pollution Control

This comprises the regulation and control of pollutants to the air in the Metropolitan area including plan examination, field inspection, by-law enforcement, air sampling and laboratory examination. This is a 100% Metropolitan function.

The 1960 expenditure was $244,132 or 16 cents per capita. This represents 2.7% of the total expenditure of the Metropolitan Works Department. It also represents 0.57% of the total expenditure of all Works Departments and 0.30% of the total expenditure for all functions considered.

Hydro

This includes the maintenance, operation and construction (other than capital) of complete Hydro Electric systems. Although this is a function of the Works Department in only one Area Municipality, it has been included for comparative purposes in this analysis. In the case of the Toronto Hydro Electric System, expenditure figures for 1959 have been used as the 1960 figures are not yet available.

The total 1960 Works Department expenditure on this function was $236,574 (15 cents per capital) being 0.55% of the total expenditure for all Works Departments. The total expenditure on this function was $18,576,244 (not including cost of power) being $12.06 per capita. This represents 22.70% of the total expenditure on all functions considered.

Miscellaneous Functions

This includes in various Townships weed control, safety inspection, subdivision control, pest control and dog licensing and control.

These functions are under Works Department jurisdiction in seven of the Area Municipalities. The total Works Department expenditure on these functions in 1960 was $368,742 being 24 cents per capita and representing 0.86% of the total expenditure for all Works Departments. The total 1960 expenditure was $445,454 or 29 cents per capita and represents 0.55% of the total expenditure for all functions considered.

Summary

Table showing total 1960 expenditure by functions:

Function	1960 Total Expenditure $	Cost per Capita $	% of total Expenditure for all functions considered
Sewage Collection	3,411,204	2.21	4.17
Sewage Treatment	2,447,222	1.59	2.99
Industrial Waste Control	23,365	0.02	0.03
Water Distribution	5,551,798	3.60	6.78
Water Purification, etc.	4,658,311	3.02	5.69
Roads and Bridges	23,398,412	15.19	28.59
Garbage	10,248,743	6.66	12.52
Parks	8,611,819	5.59	10.52
Traffic	2,813,959	1.83	3.44
Building and Plumbing Inspection	1,405,288	.91	1.72

Function	1960 Total Expenditure $	Cost per Capita $	% of total Expenditure for all functions considered
Air Pollution Control	244,132	0.16	0.30
Hydro	18,576,244 *	12.06	22.70
Miscellaneous Functions	445,454	0.29	0.55
Totals	81,835,951	53.13	100.00

* 1959 expenditure - Toronto Hydro-Electric System.

Table showing total Works Departments 1960 expenditure by functions:

Function	1960 Total Departments' Expenditures $	Cost per Capita $	% of total Expenditure of all Works Departments
Sewage Collection	3,411,204	2.21	7.92
Sewage Treatment	2,447,222	1.59	5.68
Industrial Waste Control	23,365	0.02	0.05
Water Distribution	4,640,657	3.01	10.78
Water Purification, etc.	4,658,311	3.02	10.82
Roads and Bridges	15,705,583	10.19	36.47
Garbage	9,419,334	6.11	21.87
Parks	365,465	0.24	0.85
Traffic	1,440,946	0.94	3.35
Building and Plumbing Inspection	99,375	0.06	0.23
Air Pollution Control	244,132	0.16	0.57
Hydro	236,574	0.15	0.55
Miscellaneous Functions	368,742	0.24	0.86
Totals	43,060,910	27.94	100.00

Recapitulation

	1960 Total Expenditure $	Cost per Capita $	% of total Expenditure of all Works Departments	% of total Expenditure for all functions considered
Area Municipality Works Department	34,013,056	22.07	78.99	41.56
Metro Works Department	9,047,854	5.87	21.01	11.06

	1960 Total Expenditure $	Cost per Capita $	% of total Expenditure of all Works Departments	% of total Expenditure for all functions considered
Area Municipality for all functions	64,556,613	41.91	-	78.86
Metro for all functions	17,279,338	11.22	-	21.14
Grand Total Works Department	43,060,910	27.94	100.00	52.62
Grand Total All Functions	81,835,951	53.13	-	100.00

Table showing 1960 total staff by functions:

Function	Total 1960 Staff	% of total staff of all functions considered
Sewage Collection	731	7.06
Sewage Treatment	314	3.03
Industrial Waste Control	6	0.06
Water Distribution	753	7.28
Water Purification, etc.	405	3.91
Roads and Bridges	1,627	15.72
Garbage	2,270:1/2	21.94
Parks	1,156	11.17
Traffic	196	1.89
Building and Plumbing Inspection	243:1/2	2.35
Air Pollution Control	44	0.43
Hydro	2,532	24.46
Miscellaneous Functions	72:1/2	0.70
Totals	10,350:1/2	100.00

Question No. 11 For each function performed by your Department, Board, etc. as given in the answer to question 10, indicate the degree to which you consider there is duplication or overlapping of work also being performed by one or more Metropolitan Departments or Boards or by one or more Departments or Boards in the Area Municipalities.

Total Number of Local Departments indicating duplication:

Function	No duplication	Small duplication	Moderate duplication	Considerable duplication
Sewage Collection	13	1	-	-
Sewage Treatment	14	-	-	-
Industrial Waste Control	14	-	-	-
Water Distribution	13	1	-	-
Water Purification, etc.	14	-	-	-
Roads and Bridges	14	-	-	-
Garbage	14	-	-	-
Parks	14	-	-	-
Traffic	13	1	-	-
Building and Plumbing Inspection	14	-	-	-
Air Pollution Control	14	-	-	-
Hydro	14	-	-	-
Miscellaneous functions	14	-	-	-

Note: Where no answer was given in the questionnaire, it was assumed that the Municipality felt that no duplication existed.

PART III

LOCAL DEPARTMENTS HAVING NO METROPOLITAN COUNTERPARTS

PART THREE

LOCAL DEPARTMENTS HAVING NO METROPOLITAN COUNTERPARTS

CHAPTER 19

BUILDING ACTIVITIES

In 1960, the City of Toronto, North York, Scarborough, Etobicoke and East York had separate building departments. Their combined total expenditures for the year came to $1,458,000, and their combined staff numbered 256. In addition another 34 employees in other than building departments are engaged in building activities in North York, Etobicoke and the eight municipalities which have no building departments.

With regard to the question on duplication, four of the five departments reported that there is none, and the fifth did not answer.

Since the following summary discusses in considerable detail the possible effects of amalgamation, further discussion is not required here. The overlap of building activities with works department activities should be noted however, and the reader is referred to Chapter 18 on Works for a comparable picture on building activities independently derived by the Metropolitan Toronto Works Department in preparing their summary.

The summary of information on building activities follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED FROM
INFORMATION COLLECTED ON BUILDING DEPARTMENTS

In the development of new urban areas and the redevelopment of older areas municipalities have a crucial part to play. The principal authority for their operations is found in "The Planning Act" (R.S.O. 1960, Chapter 296). Part I entitled Official Plans deals with the duties of planning boards, especially with the preparation of an Official Plan to serve as a guide in municipal action necessary for the proper development of land. Part II entitled Subdivisions deals with the division of land to the mutual advantage of local government bodies and private owners. Part III entitled Restricted Area and Building By-laws is concerned with restrictions on the use of land (zoning) and regulations of the buildings and other structures erected on land. While Planning Boards and their staffs are concerned with the preparation of Official Plans and the administration of subdivision controls over land, Building Departments have the responsibility to administer zoning by-laws and building regulations governing the erection of the ultimate buildings. When the physical municipal services have been installed, the use of the land determined and the division of land into building lots approved, then a Building Department can issue permits for the erection of buildings and follow up with inspections of the actual construction.

At the present time planning boards are local bodies separated from the municipal governments which appoint the members and pay the expenses thereof. Thus in theory planning boards and their staffs are not directly answerable to municipal councils, while building departments are integral parts of ordinary municipal administration. However there is nothing to prevent liaison between the two different staffs when their concern is with the same geographical areas. At the same time it is recognized that the regulation of building is a separate function from planning which is advisory rather than administrative.

Section 30, in Part III of the Planning Act, deals with restricted area by-laws and Section 31 with building by-laws. In addition to the basic item of issuing permits for and inspecting the erection of buildings, section 31 itemizes controls over heating equipment, the removal and wrecking of buildings, the regulation of electrical apparatus and other fixed hazardous equipment and of plumbing and drains attached to fixed structures.

Thus section 31 spells out the basic duties of a building department, what we can refer to as buildings functions.

The enforcement of restricted area (zoning) by-laws usually falls to the building department, but with greater or less emphasis in different municipalities. The preparation and revision of zoning by-laws under section 30 is usually considered a function of planning and legal departments, but provision can be made within a building department for a section dealing with the continuing revision of zoning by-laws, subject to conforming with an Official Plan where such a plan has been formally approved. When both a building department and a planning board process zoning applications there is a danger of duplication of function.

Where an official plan is in effect sections 17 and 18 of the Act allow the establishment of a committee of adjustment which may vary restricted area and other by-laws implementing any official plan. A building inspector may allow deviations from building by-laws, but only a committee of adjustment may, subject to higher approval, vary zoning and other by-laws to permit the issuing of a building permit. While a few years ago provincial legislation allowed planning boards to establish committees of adjustment, this is no longer permitted and the trend is for committees to work more closely with building departments than with planning boards.

All municipalities in the Metropolitan Toronto federation retain control over local official plans, zoning by-laws and the issuing of building permits and inspections attendant thereto. Within the different municipalities however there is no necessary uniformity in the processing of building applications and the inspection of construction. While in all municipalities one individual can be pointed to as the Building Inspector, this cannot be taken as prima facie evidence of the existence of a building department, especially where the person in charge is under another department, usually Works. Furthermore, for the purposes of this summary it was arbitrarily decided that where no more than two employees were concerned this grouping of one or two employees should not be designated a department.

The result is that only five of the area municipalities are considered to have building departments.

In no two municipalities do building departments perform exactly the same functions. Before presenting the actual summary of the questionnaires of the five Building Departments a sketch of how each of the thirteen area municipalities deals with buildings functions will be given, in descending order of size of municipality by population. After the summary proper comments will be made and questions posed on the possible effects of amalgamation of building departments.

ADMINISTRATION OF BUILDING BY-LAWS IN AREA MUNICIPALITIES

City of Toronto

Appended to the City of Toronto questionnaire is an organizational chart and description of functions of the Department of Buildings and Development, both as it is at present and is planned for the future. Together with this plan and description is a detailed list of positions within the different sections, prepared in September 1961 by the Department, and a schematic presentation of this detailed breakdown prepared by the Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board.

The sectional list shows 159 positions, including 5 for the committee of adjustment. The list can be used to produce a number of different organizational breakdowns. The list itself suggests the following breakdown of the employees directly employed by the Department:

EMPLOYEES	SECTION
15	Administration
14	Permit Control
17	Zoning
22	Engineering
86	Inspection
154	

The positions listed can be allocated to the sections shown in the organizational chart to produce other breakdowns. The basic division of the 154 employees is 13 to Administration and 141 to the Building Regulation Division. After including the Director of Building Regulation and secretary with the administrative staff, the remaining employees can be distributed 53 to regulation and enforcement and 86 to inspection sections.

To allow comparison with other municipalities a division has been made as follows:

EMPLOYEES	DIVISION
15	Administration
43	Permit Control
45	Building Inspection
15	Plumbing Inspection
8	Zoning by-law enforcement
28	Other functions
154	

The figure of 28 for other functions is made up of five employees in the Hazards Inspection Branch, two employees in the By-law revision branch of the Engineering Section, and 21 employees in the Housing Inspection Branch. These last administer the Standard of Housing By-law, which is authorized by a special act of the Ontario legislature for the City of Toronto only. These employees do not have counterparts in any of the other municipalities. In 1960 the City of Toronto was still licensing passenger elevators but the Province of Ontario now inspects and licenses elevators everywhere in the province. For the future a Development Division and an Improvement Section are outlined.

North York

The North York Building Department is divided into four sections under section heads with the following titles and employees:

TITLE	EMPLOYEES
Chief Plan Examiner	11
Chief Building Inspector	11
Chief Plumbing Inspector	9
Chief Clerk	11
Building Commissioner	1
	43

Responsibility for investigation of zoning by-law complaints lies with the By-law Enforcement and License Department. Of its 10 regular employees, however, 4 are dog catchers, and the License Inspector and a clerk spend much of their time issuing dog licenses. While a large part of the time of the remaining employees is zoning by-law administration, some of it is spent on varied other duties.

Scarborough

The building Department is divided into four sections with three division heads. The establishment is as follows:

TITLE	EMPLOYEES
Chief Plan Examiner	3
Supervisor of Building Inspectors	8
Chief Inspector of Plumbing and Drains	10
Administration	4
Building Commissioner and Deputy	2
	27

At the end of 1960 the questionnaire reported a total of 26 employees, divided 16 in the Building Division and 10 in the Plumbing Division.

There is no by-law enforcement section as such. In the Scarborough Works Department much scrutiny is given to site plans for new developments to insure proper services, so that some work done in other municipalities by Building Departments may be performed in Scarborough by the Works Department.

Etobicoke

The Building Department has four sections and administrative personnel as follows:

FUNCTION	EMPLOYEES
Clerical Staff	6
Plan Examination	5
Building Inspection	8
Zoning Inspection	3
Flammable Liquid Inspection	2
Building Commissioner and Deputy	2
	26

In the Works Department under the Township Engineer there is a separate Plumbing Inspection Section with 6 plumbing inspectors.

York

York Township does not have a building department as such but in the Works Department there is a Building section with 6 employees and a Plumbing section with 3 employees. In addition, in the Clerk's Department there is a By-law Enforcement section established in 1959 which has 3 employees. In both departments there are other employees doing some of the clerical and administration work for the buildings employees.

East York

The composition of the Building and Plumbing Department is: Chief Building Inspector, Assistant Building Inspector, Secretary, By-law Enforcement Officer, Plumbing Inspector and Drain Inspector.

Forest Hill

The General Office personnel of the Works Department include a plan examiner and a building and plumbing inspector. Responsibilities of the Works Commissioner over building and plumbing are listed as the following:

1. Applications - Building, Plumbing and Drains.
2. Plan Examining re: Permits
3. Building and Plumbing Inspection
4. Information Service
5. Planning Studies
6. Zoning by-laws
7. Restaurant Inspections
8. Multiple Occupancy

Leaside

There is a Building Inspector, an assistant, and a separated Plumbing Inspector. The Plumbing Inspector is also the Deputy Fire Chief. All work under the Works Superintendent, who is also the Fire Chief, but building permits are issued by the Town Clerk. Building Inspections of older buildings are usually carried out in co-operation with the Fire Department.

Mimico

There is a Building Inspector, who is also responsible for other related duties and has a temporary assistant. Both work under the Clerk and the Treasurer, making use of other staff for clerical duties when necessary.

New Toronto

Here too a Building, etc. Inspector operates under the Clerk.

Long Branch

The Building, Sanitary and License Inspector who works under the Clerk is assisted part of the day by the Welfare Administrator.

Weston

There is a Building Inspector nominally under the Town Engineer but working closely with the Clerk.

Swansea

In the office of the Comptroller and Clerk-Treasurer is a Planning and Building Commissioner who divides his time between municipal planning and building inspection activities.

The data on personnel engaged in Buildings activities is summarized in the following table:

Buildings Activities in Area Municipalities - 1960

Municipality and Department Concerned	Admin.	Permit Control	Building Inspection	Plumbing Inspection	Zoning Enforcement	Others	Total Staff
Toronto-Buildings and Development	15	43	45	15	8	28	154
North York-Building	12	11	11	9			43)
-By-law enforcement and licensing	?				Approx 5		5) 48
Scarborough - Building	6	3	8	10			27
Etobicoke - Building	8	5	8		3	2	26)
-Township Engineer (Works)	?			6			6) 32
York - Works	?		6	3			9)
- Clerks					3		3) 12
East York - Building and Plumbing	1	1	1	2	1		6
Forest Hill - Works	?	1	1				2
Leaside - Works and Clerk's	?		2	1			3
Mimico - Clerk's	?		1	1			2
New Toronto - Clerk's	?	1					1
Long Branch - Clerk's	?	1/3	1				1-1/3
Weston - Works and Clerk's	?	1					1
Swansea - Clerk's	?	1					1
12 Suburbs - total personnel engaged	31	20 1/3	41	30	12	2	136-1/3
Total personnel engaged	46	63 1/3	86	45	20	30	290-1/3

The titles and, where known, the salaries of administrative heads over Buildings activities is given in the following table for 1960:

Municipality and Department	Title of Head and Salary	Title of Deputy or Other and Salary
Toronto - Buildings and Development	Commissioner $15,700	Director of Building Regulation $10,900.
North York - Building	Commissioner $10,757	Chief Plan Examiner $7,452 Chief Building Inspector $7,866 Chief Plumbing Inspector $7,866
-By-law Enforcement and Licensing	Officer & Controller $7,455	
Scarborough - Building	Commissioner $8,776	Deputy $8,008
Etobicoke - Building	Commissioner $11,635	Deputy $8,290
York - Works and Clerk's	-	-
East York - Building and Plumbing	Chief Building Inspector $7,000.	
Forest Hill - Works	-	-
Leaside - Building	Building Inspector and Plan Examiner $7,935	Plumbing Inspector and Deputy Fire Chief $6,500
Mimico - Clerk's	Building etc. Inspector	
New Toronto - Clerk's	Building etc. Inspector $5,460	
Long Branch - Clerk's	Building etc. Inspector $5,200	
Weston - Clerk's and Works	Building Inspector	
Swansea - Clerk's	Planning and Building Commissioner $5,760	

SUMMARY - BUILDING DEPARTMENTS IN TORONTO, NORTH YORK, SCARBOROUGH, ETOBICOKE AND EAST YORK

HEADS AND SALARIES

The titles and salaries in 1960 of the administrative heads in the five municipal buildings departments are as follows.

Municipality and Title of Head	Salary of Head $	Salary of Deputy or Other $
Toronto		
Buildings Commissioner	15,700	
Director of Building Regulations		10,900
North York		
Building Commissioner	10,757	
Chief Plan Examiner		7,452
Chief Building Inspector		7,866
Chief Plumbing Inspector		7,866
Scarborough		
Building Commissioner	8,776	
Deputy Building Commissioner		8,008
Etobicoke		
Building Commissioner	11,635	
Deputy Building Commissioner		8,290
East York		
Chief Building Inspector	7,000	
TOTAL SALARIES	53,868	50,382

STAFF DIVISIONS

Distribution of employees by function for 1960 is somewhat arbitrary but Table I does indicate the general distribution of responsibilities within the different departments. Permit Control includes the checking of plans. The breakdown for the Toronto department is for the 1961 employment figure of 154; elsewhere the figures reported in the Toronto questionnaire of 143 permanent and 5 temporary are used. The breakdown for Scarborough is for the departmental establishment of 27; at the end of 1960 there were 26 employees.

TABLE 1. BUILDING DEPARTMENTS IN FIVE AREA MUNICIPALITIES

Permanent Staff Distribution by Functions - 1960-1961

Municipality	Administration	Permit Control	Building Inspection	Plumbing Inspection	Zoning Enforcement	Others	Total Staff
Toronto	15	43	45	15	8	28	154
North York	12	11	11	9			43
Scarborough	6	3	8	10			27
Etobicoke	8	5	8		3	2	26
East York	1	1	1	2	1		6
TOTAL	42	63	73	36	12	30	256

In the table the "Others" column includes for Toronto 21 employees in Housing Inspection 5 in Hazards and 2 in Engineering By-law revision, and for Etobicoke the Flammable Liquid Inspection section. With greater specialization the Administration staff in the Toronto department is relatively smaller than in the suburban departments.

CHANGES IN STAFF AND SALARIES - 1952 TO 1960

Table 2 shows the number of permanent and temporary employees reported at the end of each year from 1952 to 1960, together with the salaries and wages paid out to the permanent and temporary employees in each of those years. The five departments show between 1952 and 1960 an overall increase in the number of permanent and temporary employees combined from 208 to 249, and an increase in salary payments from $700,501 to $1,224,774. Unfortunately figures for the two years are not really comparable. This is especially true for Toronto, the largest department, where there has been a drastic rearrangement of departmental responsibilities in the last few years, especially between Buildings, Property and Health Departments.

TABLE 2: BUILDING DEPARTMENT AVERAGE MUNICIPALITIES - [illegible] Salaries 1952 to 1960

Year	City of Toronto		North York		Scarborough		Etobicoke		West York		Five Municipalities	
	Employees	Salaries	Employees	Salaries	Employees	Salaries	Employees	Salaries	Employees	Salaries	Employees	Salaries
1952												
Perm.	92	336,603							5	17,674	134	467,393
Temp.	73	232,500							1	608	74	233,108
Comb.	165	569,103	12	39,252	13	36,424	12	7,440	6	18,282	208	700,501
1953												
Perm.	96	365,2[illegible]							5	18,398	147	521,917
Temp.	42	201,100							1	631	43	201,811
Comb.	138	566,446	15	49,411	18	49,841	13	[illegible],001	6	19,029	190	723,728
1954												
Perm.	92	361,42[illegible]									154	561,301
Temp.	104	240,9[illegible]									104	240,913
Comb.	196	602,5[illegible]	16	66,183	24	64,478	17	4[illegible],885	5	17,326	258	802,214
1955												
Perm.	103	417,502									176	680,013
Temp.	85	302,17[illegible]									85	302,179
Comb.	188	719,761	18	76,146	30	91,219	20	75,645	5	19,421	261	982,192
1956												
Perm.	104	433,791									179	728,058
Temp.	51	242,55[illegible]									51	242,563
Comb.	155	676,335	19	85,799	27	104,947	23	36,019	6	17,502	230	970,621
1957												
Perm.	102	462,231									173	779,480
Temp.	75	285,81[illegible]									75	285,813
Comb.	177	748,044	19	98,026	24	102,422	24	[illegible]8,087	4	17,714	248	1,065,293
1958												
Perm.	98	479,53[illegible]									175	829,304
Temp.	69	265,375									69	265,375
Comb.	167	745,0[illegible]	21	103,016	27	110,890	25	117,773	4	17,992	244	1,094,679
1959												
Perm.	122	489,013									216	950,190
Temp.	25	76,967									25	76,967
Comb.	147	565,[illegible]	35	179,980	30	133,190	25	1[illegible]3,969	4	19,038	241	1,027,157
1960												
Perm.	143	661,242									244	1,172,882
Temp.	5	51,892									5	51,892
Comb.	148	713,134	43	206,423	26	146,168	26	1[illegible]1,944	6	27,105	249	1,224,774

Perm. = Permanent. Temp. = Temporary. Comb. = Combined Permanent and Temporary.

Similarly the North York department did not have responsibility for checking building applications for conformity with Zoning by-laws, or for control over plumbing permits and inspections until 1959. In the last few years there has been a definite increase in zoning by-law enforcement activities. Primarily, the growth of building activities in both city and suburbs occasioned an increased workload for buildings staff, so that the increase in permanent staff from 134 in 1952 to 244 in 1960 may be quite illustrative of the actual trend in this period for personnel engaged in building department activities.

DUPLICATION

The City of Toronto questionnaire did not include an answer to question 11. The other four departments all report "NO DUPLICATION", and hence made no further explanations or observations.

TABLE 3: BUILDING DEPARTMENTS IN FIVE AREA MUNICIPALITIES - TOTAL EXPENDITURES IN 1960

	Total Salaries and Wages	Pensions	Hospital Payments	U.I.C.	Work-Men's Comp.	Sick Pay Grants	Total Fringe Benefits	All Wage Costs	Other Exp.	Total Exp. other than Salaries & Wages	Total Exp.	Assessed Population	Total Exp. per Capita
City of Toronto	713,134	65,334	3,456	1,804		5,780	76,386	789,520	65,087	141,473	854,607	644,948	1.32
North York	206,423	10,200		1,040			11,240	217,663	30,130	41,370	247,793	247,764	1.00
Scarborough	146,168	6,391	2,124				8,515	154,683	16,754	25,269	171,437	198,724	.86
Etobicoke	131,944	6,091			1,109		7,200	139,144	11,620	18,820	150,764	145,847	1.03
East York	27,105	1,400		875			2,275	29,380	4,303	6,578	33,683	69,373	.48
Five Municipalities	1,224,774	89,416	5,592	3,719	1,109	5,780	105,616	1,330,390	127,894	233,510	1,458,284	1,306,656	1.11

TOTAL EXPENDITURES

A summary of expenditures reported for Building Departments is presented in Table 3. Fringe benefit payments such as employer contributions tc pension funds, for hospitalization and insurance, have been itemized separately, and then combined to produce a total of $105,616. Because some fringe benefits are paid by a central municipal body rather than the department concerned this may not be the complete figure. Expenditures other than those associated with wage and salary costs totalled $127,894. The two largest items here are for automobile travel and for materials and supplies. For the five departments the grand total expenditures reported for 1960 were $1,458,284. On a per capita basis the range was from $ .48 to $1.32, with a five municipality average of $1.11.

FUNCTIONS

All five departments reported a percentage breakdown by function of their departmental expenditures. In some municipalities there was quite a detailed breakdown, so that it was necessary to combine figures to produce in Table 4 a table which would be comparable with Table 1 on distribution of employment. Differences in interpretation of administration costs may mean that the figures are not entirely comparable.

TABLE 4: BUILDING DEPARTMENTS IN FIVE AREA MUNICIPALITIES FUNCTIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL CURRENT EXPENDITURES.

Municipality	Administration	Permit Control	Building Inspection	Plumbing Inspection	Zoning Enforcement	Others	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Toronto	20.5	20.0	38.0	10.0	5.0	6.5	100.0
North York	18.6	31.2	28.9	21.3			100.0
Scarborough	23.0	7.0	28.0	42.0			100.0
Etobicoke	25.0	19.0	41.0		15.0		100.0
East York	12.0	39.5	18.5	24.9	5.1		100.0

Some indication of the workload may be obtained from Table 5 which lists the permits and inspections reported as workload by the five departments. However, it must be remembered that individual permits may be for single family houses or for 100 suite apartment buildings, for a single car garage or a three million dollar factory.

TABLE 5: BUILDING DEPARTMENTS IN FIVE AREA MUNICIPALITIES
WORKLOAD REPORTED

FUNCTION	City	N.Y.	Scar.	Etob.	East York
PERMITS ISSUED:					
Building Permits	10,570	4,410	6,325	4,491	366
Plumbing and Drain Permits	2,562	7,446	5,275		300
Heating Permits	5,435				
Signs Permits	888	882			
Dry Cleaning & Hazard Licenses	811				
Elevator Licenses	1,736				
Elevator Permits	149				
INSPECTIONS AND ENFORCEMENT:					
Building	49,462	23,000	39,633	23,870	2,500
Summonses issued				43	
Plumbing	15,260	19,335	20,572		1,500
Drain					1,500
Heating	14,165				
Signs	5,313	Continuous			
Dry Cleaning and Hazards	9,047				
Housing By-law Enforcement	25,075				
Zoning By-law investigations	6,100			109	350
Summonses issued				35	
Lot Inspections		611			
Flammable Liquid Inspections				2,255	
Summonses Issued				91	
License Applications processed				319	
Other applications processed				2,280	

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA ON WORKLOAD

The construction industry is not noted for its stability. What is built and in what quantity is subject to great variation from year to year. As well, in a metropolitan area there can be shifts from area to area so that the individual municipalities may show changes from year to year that are in marked contrast to what is happening in the area as a whole. Thus the municipal building departments are faced with a difficult problem in deciding what number of persons should be employed on a permanent basis. Similarly, a comparison of workload and number of employees employed by municipality may be unfair or misleading when only one year's workload is presented.

Table 6 presents, for all thirteen area municipalities, a comparison of the personnel employed in buildings operations with the value of building permits issued during 1960, together with the number of dwelling units (houses and apartment suites) started and the number of completed in 1960. The number of personnel shown, 290 1/3, was discussed in detail at the beginning of this report. Of the value of building permits issued — $322,575,000, non-residential uses accounted for $168,781,000, and residential for the remaining $163,794,000. Of this residential total the City of Toronto had only $19,274,000, while it issued $88,198,000 for non-residential uses, over half of the $168,781,000 in that category. The remaining non-residential-$80,583,000 — was split between the nine inner suburbs — $11,043,000, and the three outer suburbs — $69,540,000.

TABLE 6: ALL AREA MUNICIPALITIES

BUILDINGS ACTIVITIES COMPARED WITH BUILDINGS STAFF - 1960

Municipality	Buildings Staff	Building Permits		New Dwellings	
		Total Value ($ 000)	Res. Units (#)	Starts (#)	Completions (#)
City of Toronto	154	107,472	2,061	1,753	2,765
North York	48	82,348	4,887	5,217	4,365
Scarborough	27	53,177	3,530	2,693	3,020
Etobicoke	32	53,088	2,424	2,303	2,373
York	12	12,443	993	406	413
East York	6	6,741	688	575	1,020
Forest Hill	2	4,614	674	332	348
Leaside	3	5,323	361	268	279
Mimico	2	3,142	385	365	642
New Toronto	1	573	8	12	72
Long Branch	1 1/3	1,274	93	91	71
Weston	1	2,121	218	152	127
Swansea	1	259	19	13	171
Totals	290 1/3	332,575	16,341	14,180	15,666

Sources: Metropolitan Affairs Study

D.B.S. publication "Building Permits" February, 1961 issue.

M.T.P.B. publication "New Residential Construction" based on C.M.H.C. data.

The distribution of the value of residential and non-residential permits in the different parts of Metropolitan Toronto is as follows:

	(Thousands of Dollars)			
	Nine Inner	Three Outer	12 Suburbs	City of Toronto
Residential	$ 25,447	$ 119,073	$ 144,520	$ 19,274
Non-residential	11,043	69,540	80,583	88,198
	$ 36,490	$ 188,613	$ 225,103	$ 107,472

Of the $88,198,000 for non-residential in the City of Toronto, $34,123,000 was for institutional and government, which represented nearly 60% of the Metro total of $59,523,000. Of interest is the large amount for non-residential permits in the twelve suburbs, especially in the above outer ones. Of the $80,583,000 total, $25,400,000 was for institutional and government construction.

Traditionally the central city has expected the high rise office and apartment buildings, the heavy industrial buildings, and a good share of the commercial establishments. In the early 50's the main buildings erected in the suburbs were predominantly single family houses and related stores, with one storey plants in industrial areas. In the sixties the suburbs are no longer restricted to horizontal construction but are accommodating many high-rise apartments, heavier industrial buildings, and department type stores on more than one level. Of the 15,652 apartment units completed in Metropolitan Toronto in 1960, only 2,765 were in the City of Toronto.

Thus, over the period since Metropolitan Toronto was formed, suburban building departments have had to cope with a great variety of construction, with only multi-storey steel framed office buildings not making their appearance in the burgeoning suburbs. But already certain suburban areas are attracting their first prestige office clusters. With plans for "apartment cities" in suburban areas receiving serious attention, suburban no longer can be equated with horizontal housing.

Implications of Present Trends

Normally small municipalities of under 50,000 persons or more do not have to cope with the provision of services to high density developments

and the building inspection of high-rise buildings. In the Toronto Metropolitan area it has now become obvious that developers may wish to erect these traditionally down-town buildings almost anywhere in the urbanized zones.

Is it reasonable to expect a small municipality to employ the specialized staff necessary to examine properly building plans for the complex buildings of a highly urbanized society? Do suburban municipalities have sufficient building inspectors with the necessary experience to keep an expert eye on the erection of buildings other than single family houses and one storey shops and factories? Under today's conditions there are some other controlling forces affecting building operations. How much reliance is there in suburban municipalities on building plans which have been tested and tried in other municipalities, or on C.M.H.C., which may control the provision of mortgage funds and have its own inspection staff? Or has the development of the National Building Code provided municipalities with adequate guidance in dealing with new types of construction?

At present each municipality prepares and maintains its own building code. Does this represent some duplication of effort? Are there sufficient differences in building codes between area municipalities to force builders to draw new building plans when they shift operations to another municipality? On the other hand, do builders find it advantageous to operate in some or other municipalities whose plans examination and inspection is of an indifferent order? Where Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation money is involved C.M.H.C. standards prevail where they are higher than those of a municipality. Does the use of conventional mortgage money mean fewer building restrictions and less rigid inspection in municipalities with severely taxed building departments?

How would metropolitanization of building departments affect the number of employees? Would the reduction of a few administrative positions be more than offset by the necessity to have equal services available to all portions of Metropolitan Toronto? Would specialized by-laws like the City of Toronto's Standards of Housing by-law be applied to all parts of

Metropolitan Toronto, necessitating much additional staff? Would enforcement of zoning by-laws be standardized, despite the present differences of emphasis in enforcement among different municipalities? Are there sufficient differences between the development of new areas in the suburbs and the redevelopment of older areas in the City to justify the continuation of divided buildings operations? Are there advantages to having a different code in each municipality, and a corresponding danger that the creation of one building department would lead to a heavy-handed inflexible building code and inspection system over the entire area?

While the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act gives the Metropolitan Corporation the power to adopt an Official Plan for the entire area, the Act leaves restricted area (zoning) by-laws strictly within the purview of local municipalities subject to the qualification, as applies to other municipal by-laws and to public works, of conforming with the future Metro Official Plan. At the present time local planning boards assist in the preparation and revision of zoning by-laws, which then form one of the basic sets of rules to be observed by buildings departments in their scruting of plans and inspection of buildings being constructed under permit. But building departments themselves may initiate or process amendments to the zoning by-law. In the event that planning boards and their staffs were amalgamated without amalgamation of building departments, would building departments then have greater control over zoning by-law preparation if zoning was not also made a metropolitan responsibility?

The basic questions are: how would the total expenditures for buildings activity be affected, and would the uniform examination of plans, the inspection of buildings, and the enforcement of pertinent by-laws be satisfactory to both builders and the general public? Would responsibility for building regulation by one government be in the best interests of all parts of the Metropolitan community?

CHAPTER 20
FIRE DEPARTMENTS

All thirteen of the area municipalities had separate fire departments in 1960. In six of these the establishments called for permanent employees, in another six there was provision for volunteer firefighters in addition to regular paid employees, and in one municipality the department was staffed entirely by volunteers. There are a total of 61 fire halls in Metropolitan Toronto, a total of 2,046 permanent staff and 100 volunteers. Total wages, salaries and volunteer allowances came to $9,825,000 in 1960. The combined total for all expenditures came to $11,664,000, including nearly $475,000 paid for the use of water in firefighting. This represents an average expenditure of $7.64 per capita of Metropolitan population. The individual municipal averages however ranged from $2.31 in Swansea with its volunteer force to $12.66 in Leaside.

With regard to the question on duplication four municipalities did not answer, while the other nine noted no duplication.

The larger question concerning possible advantages and disadvantages which might be expected under amalgamation is discussed very extensively in the following summary and no additional comments are felt necessary here.

The summary follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED FROM INFORMATION COLLECTED ON FIRE DEPARTMENTS

All thirteen area municipalities returned Section II questionnaires re Fire Departments, all indicating separate departmental organization. In six municipalities the 1960 establishments called for permanent employees, in another six there was provision for volunteer firefighters in addition to regular paid employees, and in one municipality the department was staffed entirely by volunteers receiving honorariums or allowances for their services.

ADMINISTRATIVE HEADS

At the end of 1960 there were thirteen fire department chiefs, of whom eleven were on salaries which totalled $92,259 for 1960. In Swansea the Chief received an honorarium of $330 for heading the volunteer force. In Leaside the position of Fire Chief is held by the Works Department Superintendent (salary and car allowance $5,400) who receives an honorarium of $2,000 for his fire duties.

Nine municipalities had deputy chiefs on salaries which totalled $62,571 in 1960. In Swansea the Deputy Chief received an honorarium of $280. In Leaside there is a composite position of Deputy Fire Chief and Plumbing Inspector for which a salary of $6,000 was paid plus a car allowance of $500. Forest Hill had two Platoon Chiefs earning a total of $13,800 in 1960. Long Branch did not have a Deputy Chief or Division Heads.

TABLE I FIRE DEPARTMENTS IN AREA MUNICIPALITIES AT DECEMBER 31, 1960.

Area Municipality	Fire Halls	Volunteers	Permanent Staff: Total Number	Permanent Staff: Chiefs	Permanent Staff: Captains	Permanent Staff: Firemen	Permanent Staff: Administration: Professional	Permanent Staff: Administration: Clerical	1960 Permanent Wages and Salaries	1960 Volunteer Allowances	Total Wages, Salaries and Allowances in 1960
City of Toronto	28	0	1210	42	212	944	4	8	5,911,866	0	5,911,866
North York	7*	16	214	5	47	160	1	1	968,062	2,400	970,462
Scarborough	7	0	184	7	38	138	0	1	801,073	0	801,073
Etobicoke	7*	15	133	5	26	101	0	1	662,201	3,500	665,701
York	3	0	116	4	14	97	1	0	562,757	0	562,757
East York	2	0	65	3	15	46	1	0	278,377	0	278,377
Forest Hill	1	0	34	3	5	24	2	0	194,791	0	194,791
Leaside	1	0	40	2	5	32	1	0	187,729	0	187,729
Mimico	1	2	10	2	3	5	0	0	47,799	887	48,686
New Toronto	1	16	22	2	4	16	0	0	101,055	1,250	102,305
Long Branch	1	16	5	1	0	4	0	0	24,373	3,843	28,216
Weston	1	8	13	2	0	11	0	0	58,177	2,500	60,677
Swansea	1*	27	0						5,613**	6,847	12,460
All Municipalities	61	100	2046	78	369	1578	10	11	9,803,873	21,227	9,825,100

* One Volunteer Station.

** Covers payments for weekend telephone duty, and to truck mechanics.

STAFFS AND REMUNERATION

The accompanying Table 1 gives certain statistics on municipal fire departments in 1960. Classification has been made of permanent staff only. Chiefs includes Platoon and District Chiefs as well as Department Chiefs and Deputies. Professional staff includes Directors of Fire Prevention Bureaus and others whose duties may be carried out by regular firefighters in municipalities indicating no specialized staff. Since the questionnaire did not specifically ask about allowances for volunteers there may be additional amounts not shown that went to volunteer firefighters.

In the twelve Departments with permanent employees, all had head office or administrative sections with a total of 46 employees. Six departments had Fire Prevention bureaus, showing a total of 55 on staff. Three departments had both training and equipment maintenance sections, with totals of 6 and 13 employees respectively. The City of Toronto has a Fire Alarm Telegraph Division employing 23 men to maintain the alarm box system, and also a full time medical doctor.

Of the 1960 total of 2046 permanent employees, the remaining 1902 are shown as firemen. In most of the smaller departments these Firemen also perform necessary duties such as equipment maintenance and fire prevention which are the responsibility of special sections in the larger departments. Similarly training becomes the responsibility of the administrative personnel in the smaller municipalities.

TABLE 2. FIRE DEPARTMENT STAFFS AND REMUNERATION, 1952 to 1960

Year	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Population	1,133,376	1,172,975	1,253,240	1,304,363	1,311,336	1,380,775	1,429,207	1,487,348	1,527,105
Permanent employees	1,147	1,187	1,262	1,350	1,443	1,769	1,826	1,912	2,046
Change in permanent employees	NA	47	75	88	93	326	57	86	134
Permanent employees per 1000 persons	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.03	1.10	1.28	1.28	1.29	1.34
Remuneration paid	4,297,564	4,602,930	4,934,748	5,263,046	5,838,711	6,816,085	8,134,066	8,864,360	9,803,873
Volunteer personnel reported	153	147	153	150	133	134	109	69	68
Change from preceeding year	NA	-6	6	-3	-17	1	-25	-40	-1
Allowances paid	20,624	30,331	32,067	32,090	28,466	27,965	23,861	17,318	17,577
Combined staffs	1,300	1,334	1,415	1,500	1,576	1,903	1,935	1,981	2,114
Change from preceeding year	NA	34	81	85	76	327	32	46	133
Total	4,318,188	4,633,261	4,966,815	5,295,136	5,867,177	6,844,050	8,157,927	8,881,678	9,825,100

GROWTH 1952 - 1960

The accompanying Table 2 indicates how the staffs and wage costs of fire departments have grown since 1952. The number of permanent firemen increased by 899. Because all municipalities did not consider volunteer firemen as municipal employees the data for volunteers is not complete. Thus this table shows only 68 volunteers, the number reported on the questionnaires for 1960, while telephoned inquiries revealed another 32 on departmental rosters. It is also noteworthy that changes in the number of volunteers from year end to year end may not be as significant as smaller changes in the number of permanent personnel. The table also does not indicate how in some areas, volunteers were being replaced by permanent personnel at the same time as other areas were increasing volunteer forces.

As the year by year average figures for firemen per 1000 population indicate, the increase in the ratio of firefighters from 1.01 to 1.33 men per 1000 population shows that more than population increase was a factor. This increase in permanent staff was accompanied by a reduction in working hours over this same period. As an example, the reduction in the working week from 56 to 42 hours in the Toronto Fire Department accounted for an increase of 264 firefighters between 1956 and 1957. When this reduction in working hours takes place at the same time as new stations are being opened with permanent employees, it becomes virtually impossible to separate the two forces at work.

The major reasons listed for the increases in staff are as follows:

(1) Replacement of volunteers by permanent employees.

(2) Establishment of new stations with paid employees.

(3) Reduction in working hours.

(4) Expansion of existing stations and/or the purchase of additional equipment.

(5) Provision of additional specialized services, such as: training, fire prevention, general rescue work, etc.

(6) Necessity for fire departments to provide their own telephone answering service when police forces came under Metropolitan Toronto.

1960 EXPENDITURE

In analysing 1960 total expenditures for fire departments it became obvious that employer's contributions to pension funds, to the Hospital Plan, for Workmen's Compensation, for Unemployment Insurance Stamps and for other wage fringe benefits like cumulative sick pay grants could well be tabulated separately from other expenditures. While it is probable that all fringe benefits were not reported, especially where a central municipal office looks after employer's contributions for all municipal employees, a total of $840,617 is shown for these items. The fringe benefits were not broken down in all questionnaires, but separated items showed the following breakdown:

Employers' contributions:	$
Pensions	672,195
Hospital Plan	45,011
Sick Pay Grants (City only)	58,018
Workmen's Compensation	22,320
Unemployment Insurance and other supplementary benefits	43,073
Total Listed	840,617

When the total listed is added to the $9,825,100 direct wage costs, the combined wage costs and fringe benefits totalled $10,665,717. Other expenditures listed by the thirteen fire departments totalled $998,609. Nearly half of this went to pay for the use of water from hydrants or the high pressure water system in the City of Toronto provided by Metropolitan Toronto. With the deduction of the $473,837 listed as the cost of water for firefighting, a total of $524,772 was shown to have been spent in 1960 on other items. These included the heating and lighting of fire halls, maintenance of equipment and purchase of necessary supplies, provision of uniforms and protective clothing, and other necessary expenditures such as telephones, radio servicing and insurance on buildings and equipment.

Generally fire departments did much of their own work, such as motor vehicle maintenance, and made use of private or outside firms for only the usual expenditures like telephone service, lighting and water, and laundry services for bedding.

The grand total of all wage costs and other expenditures shown in the questionnaires came to $11,664,326, as shown in Table 3. Using the population figure of 1,527,105, this represented an expenditure of $7.64 per person in Metropolitan Toronto. The actual municipal averages ranged from $2.31 in Swansea with its voluntary force to $12.66 in Leaside. Among the twelve municipalities having permanent forces it is noteworthy that those with the lowest per capita fire expenditures, Mimico with $3.41 and Long Branch with $3.54, - also had among the lowest per capita assessments, $1706 and $1649. Similarly those with the highest per capita expenditures, Leaside with $12.66 and Forest Hill with $11.50, had among the highest per capita assessments, $3974 and $3120 respectively. The average per capita assessment for all area municipalities, derived from the assessments for Metropolitan purposes used to obtain the Metropolitan levy in 1960 by dividing by the 1960 assessed population, was $2484.

FUNCTIONS

In one sense fire departments can be said to have only one function, to which all separated responsibilities like fire prevention and personnel training are related. However there are related duties of a general rescue nature which appear to be growing in number, such as resuscitation services for drowning or heart disease victims, but as yet the time required for such mercy runs is not separately tabulated. In one municipality at least the fire department supplies drivers for an ambulance service. In Scarborough the fire department is prepared to deal with falls along the lakeshore "Bluffs". When volatile fuels are spilled in traffic accidents usually firemen are called to flush away the dangerous accumulations.

In the smaller departments where there are no specialized training departments or fire prevention bureaus it would be misleading to show no time or money spent on training and fire prevention. Even in the City of Toronto department regular firefighters have been engaged in a large home inspection programme, at the same time as their pay and expenses are charged to firefighting. In general, then, any attempt to segregate various aspects of fire department activities would present a distorted picture.

DUPLICATION

On the question of duplication, four questionnaires did not indicate an attitude, while the other nine noted no duplication. The Etobicoke questionnaire noted: "Due to the geographical area of this Township, bounded by the Humber River on the East and Etobicoke River on the West, the possibility of any duplication or overlapping of the Fire Services is very remote".

TABLE 3. 1960 STAFFS AND C[illegible] MUNICIPALITY [illegible]

Municipality	Assessed Population	Permanent Staff	Permanent Staff per 1000 Population	Volunteers	Permanent Plus Volunteers	Combined Staff per 1000 Population	Total Wages, Salaries and Allowances	Employer's Pension Contribution	Hospitalization and U.I.C. Stamps	Lockpay Grants and Workmen's Compensation	Total Employer's Contributions Listed	Combined Wages etc. and Contributions	Other Expenditures Listed	Grand Total all Expenditures Listed		Assessment Per Capita
														$	Per Capita	
Toronto	644,949	1210	1.88	0	1210	1.88	5,911,[illegible]66	447,992	37,177	30,208	545,377	6,457,243	620,030	7,077,273	10.97	2870
North York	247,764	214	.86	16	230	.93	970,462	43,000	9,000	0,385	62,371	1,032,833	64,742	1,097,575	4.42	2344
Scarborough	198,724	184	.93	0	184	.93	801,073	72,132	12,503	7,500	92,221	893,294	87,483	980,777	4.93	1852
Etobicoke	145,847	1[illegible]	.91	15	145	1.01	665,701	2[illegible],863	10,92[illegible]	-	3[illegible],792	705,495	86,526	792,021	5.43	2736
York	124,195	115	.93	0	116	.93	56[illegible],737	[illegible],289	-	014	30,203	529,960	27,848	620,808	4.99	1745
East York	69,373	65	.94	0	65	.94	276,377	17,018	8,124	-	25,142	303,519	30,494	334,013	4.81	1657
Forest Hill	20,386	34	1.67	0	34	1.67	19[illegible],791	17,304	2,663	-	19,967	214,758	19,766	234,524	11.50	3120
Leaside	16,645	40	2.4	0	40	2.4	1[illegible]7,729	7,536	3,487	-	11,023	198,752	12,026	210,778	12.66	3974
Mimico	16,442	10	.61	2	12	.72	48,686	2,151	349	-	2,500	51,186	4,888	56,074	3.41	1706
New Toronto	12,941	22	1.7	16	38	2.94	1[illegible],305	4,[illegible]64	1,580	1,563	8,107	110,412	12,221	122,633	9.48	3248
Long Branch	10,783	5	.46	16	21	1.94	28,216	-	1,200	768	1,968	30,184	8,048	38,268	3.54	1649
Weston	9,535	17	1.36	8	21	2.2	60,677	1,946	-	-	1,946	62,623	14,890	77,513	8.02	2295
Swansea	9,522	0	0	27	27	2.83	12,460	-	-	-	Nil	12,460	9,609	22,069	2.31	2370
TOTAL	1,527,105	2040	1.34	100	2146	1.41	[illegible],825,100	672,195	88,084	80,338	840,617	10,665,717	998,609	11,664,326	7.64	2484

THE POSSIBLE EFFECTS OF AMALGAMATION

The basic question to be answered is how the organization, size and location of firefighting facilities would be different under amalgamation, and whether such a unified system would be better or worse than the present system. Without suggesting any final answers, this discussion will attempt to pose some of the numerous subsidiary questions which must be explored before a rational answer can be given to the basic question.

Road improvements in recent years by area municipalities and Metropolitan Toronto are helping to bring closer together most areas in Metropolitan Toronto. Do these improved road facilities, coupled with the more powerful fire vehicles now being manufactured mean that with a unified Metropolitan fire department some of the present stations could be abandoned? Would this mean a lessening of protection in those areas which lose their stations? What cost reductions could such changes bring about?

The question of the proper location for new or consolidated stations deserves serious consideration. Would suburban stations planned for construction in the near future be differently located under amalgamation? Are there advantages to locating fire halls next to police stations?

Closely related to the number of stations is the number and type of fire trucks necessary under the present and a unified system. Recently there has been a spread of high-rise buildings into suburban areas that until recently restricted buildings to a height of forty-five feet or less, the height that could be reached by small ladder trucks. Under unification would it be possible to reduce expenditures on the purchase of expensive aerial ladders where present municipal boundaries would require each municipality to have such specialized equipment? Is there other specialized equipment which can serve more than the area of some of the smaller municipalities? Is the transition of the suburbs, from areas of low density to areas in which much higher density development is now occurring, creating new problems for firefighting - problems which the smaller municipalities may find especially difficult? Is there a likelihood that taxpayers in these smaller municipalities may be forced to pay more for the additional facilities made necessary by the progress of their areas than they would if fire costs could be spread over a larger area?

At the present time there are more or less fixed understandings between area fire departments to assist each other if necessary. In a large municipal fire system there is provision for deployment of fire trucks into stations whose own vehicles are out. If such a system were applied to all of Metro, would it allow savings over the present system where divided responsibilities prevent full unified control over all vehicles within a large area? If one of the advantages of an amalgamated fire department would be the single unified communications system, would it be still more advantageous to combine this with the present police and civil defence communications network into a single fully unified Metro-wide emergency communication network?

There is as yet no central training centre for firefighters in Metropolitan Toronto. Has the present divided jurisdiction prevented the establishment of such a facility? Or are there definite benefits from the present methods of training of fire department personnel? There are probably some significant differences in the types and sizes of fires encountered in the city compared to those occurring in the outer suburbs. Are different techniques needed to provide fire protection in such different areas, and can these differing techniques be fostered more under the present divided jurisdictions than under a unified system?

There are other questions relating to the effects of unification. How would the number of firefighters, the hours they work, their pay scales and the total expense of providing firefighting services be affected? Would the very increase in size of the establishment create problems in the proper administration of a service many people feel is of extreme local importance? Would the advantages of centralized control be more than offset by the loss of volunteer firefighters and other less tangible benefits made possible by the closer contact between the existing local fire departments and the citizens they serve?

On the other hand, are there Municipalities whose limited financial resources have hindered the provision of improved firefighting services? If there are inequalities among the area municipalities in the level of fire protection they provide (as suggested by the wide variation in per capita expenditures on fire protection) are these inequalities likely to increase or decrease if no amalgamation takes place?

A look at probable future trends may be helpful in suggesting possible answers to some of the above questions.

PROBABLE FUTURE TRENDS, ASSUMING NO AMALGAMATION - AND A CONSIDERATION OF THE LIKELY EFFECT AMALGAMATION WOULD HAVE ON THESE TRENDS

It is probable that the number of "paid" firefighters, their total wages and the total cost of providing fire protection will continue to increase at a faster rate than Metro's population, because of the likely continuation of the following trends evident in the 1952 - 1960 period (see preceding pages)

(1) the gradual replacement of volunteers by permanent employees;
(2) the establishment of new stations (with paid employees) in growing areas;
(3) further reduction in working hours in those municipalities still retaining the longer work-week;
(4) expansion or replacement of existing stations and/or purchase of additional equipment, either to improve the standard of protection in an area, or to maintain the standard in the light of intensive development or redevelopment of the area;
(5) provision or extension of specialized services, such as: training, fire prevention, general rescue work etc.
(6) wage increases due either to "automatic annual increments" or to bargaining agreements, or to both.

The following comments on some of these trends will help to clarify the reasons they are thought likely to continue:

(1) It is very unlikely that any new volunteer stations will be established in new suburban areas which are developed with the full range of urban services. As well, when urbanization reaches Steeles' Avenue in north west North York it is probably that the present volunteer station at Humber Summit will give way to a "paid" station. What the future holds for volunteer firefighters in the three Lakeshore municipalities and Swansea is less certain. In these municipalities the trend to redevelopment with high rise apartment buildings may increase the demand for paid stations at the same time as changes in the population impair the community spirit that has made volunteer forces practicable and effective.

(2 & 4) In the outer suburbs additional fire halls will be needed to serve growing areas. At the same time intensive redevelopment of older areas in the inner suburbs and City may require additional or improved equipment and enlargement of existing fire halls. The displacement of one storey houses by high-rise apartments will evidently require many additional aerial ladder trucks capable of coping with fire in such tall buildings. It may also be asked whether intensive high-rise redevelopment in certain areas will require additional expenditures on the water system in order to assure an ample supply of water at sufficient pressure for firefighting purposes.

Thus both new development and redevelopment may be expected to necessitate the continued expansion of firefighting facilities. At the same time, should it become necessary to replace some of the older fire halls (a considerable number are possibly old enough and obsolete enough to merit serious consideration for replacement), redevelopment may present an opportunity for consolidation. Fewer but improved machines may well do a better job than that performed by more but older machines working out of halls linked to the days when horses pulled the pumpers. However, the number of consolidations which could take place will be restricted as long as existing municipal boundaries must be respected.

(3) The reduction in working hours, which was one of the factors in the 1952 - 1960 increase in the number of fire department personnel, has already produced some degree of uniformity in working hours. However, while 48 hour shifts are most common in the large suburbs, the City of Toronto department is organized on a 42 hour basis, and at least one municipality maintains the once common 56 hour arrangement. The requirement to have men on duty at all times considerably reduces flexibility with respect to weekly working hours, but some further reductions can be expected, with their inevitable effect on the number of personnel required.

How then would amalgamation be expected to affect each of these trends? Taking them in turn, it seems probable that:

(1) volunteers would be eliminated immediately instead of slowly;
(2) new stations would be provided in growing areas at least as rapidly as at present;
(3) working hours would be standardized immediately, probably at the City's level of 42 hours per week;
(4) there would be pressure to raise the level of firefighting services in any areas which presently have a lower level of protection to a uniform Metro-wide standard, so that heavy

expenditures on station expansions and equipment purchases could be expected. On the other hand, under amalgamation the consolidation of the system and elimination of redundant stations, together with the replacement of older equipment by new and more efficient equipment, would be able to proceed rapidly. Without intensive study it is impossible to estimate the added costs of the upgrading as against the savings of consolidating, but the former could well outweigh the latter;

(5) in the larger system the provision or extension of specialized services could be expected. While these would probably add to costs, they would also raise the general level of protection provided;

(6) the application of a standardized wage classification would occur, tending to bring any lower paid staff up to the level of those presently at a higher scale and thereby increasing the total wage bill considerably.

From the above discussion, it seems probable that amalgamation would bring about almost immediately many of the same changes which the present trends could be expected to bring about much more slowly if no amalgamation were to occur, plus some advantages and increases in efficiency which present municipal boundaries militate against. For the area as a whole, it seems possible therefore that the result of amalgamation may be a system providing a somewhat higher average level of protection, providing it equally to all parts of the Metro area, providing it with greater efficiency in many ways (and possibly with less efficiency in some ways, too), and still costing more than the total current expenditure on separate fire departments.

All this is of course conjecture, based on only a small fraction of the data which would be required to estimate with any reliability the full effects of amalgamation. In particular, the basic question - whether the benefits of an amalgamated system would more than offset the disadvantages plus added costs - cannot be answered without a much more detailed investigation. In any case, consideration must be given to the attitudes of the municipal fire departments themselves. Has there been a change in attitude since 1957-58 when twelve of the thirteen area municipalities opposed unification of area fire departments? The City of Toronto did not submit an opinion on the matter to the Special Committee re Fire Unification appointed by Metropolitan Council, which recommended no action be taken.

CHAPTER 21
HEALTH FUNCTIONS

Although this chapter has been placed in Part 3 of the report dealing with local departments which have no Metropolitan counterparts, it should be noted that the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act does give some health responsibilities to Metro, such as the hospitalization of indigents, post-sanatorium care, the Riverdale Isolation Hospital, air pollution control, water purification and water pollution control. These are, however, health responsibilities mostly associated with welfare or works activities, and as they have been covered in Chapters 17 and 18, the remaining health activities which are the responsibility of area municipalities seem to belong in this part of the report.

Health measures are administered by local boards of health or inter-municipal health units. In Metropolitan Toronto the East York - Leaside Health Unit is the only example of the latter; the other eleven municipalities have boards of health. All these have staffs working under them, which at the end of 1960 totalled approximately 950 employees. Total 1960 expenditures came to about $4,300,000., or $2.82 per capita, ranging from less than $1.00 per capita in Mimico and Long Branch to over $4.00 per capita in the City of Toronto.

In reply to the question on duplication, five of the twelve health departments did not answer, and the other seven indicated no duplication. In one case - York - it was further noted that amalgamation would change the present set-up very little, with York Township merely becoming one area of a Metropolitan Health Department. Whether amalgamation would be expected to bring certain changes in other areas, or changes in the overall efficiency, level of service provided, etc., could be determined only after further investigation.

The summary follows on the next page.

SUMMARY PREPARED FROM INFORMATION COLLECTED ON HEALTH DEPARTMENTS

Generally speaking the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act leaves responsibility for health measures to the area municipalities. The responsibilities assigned to the Metropolitan Corporation are in the main associated with welfare: the hospitalization of indigents, post sanitorium care, and Riverdale Isolation Hospital. Recent legislation also allows Metro to pay to a local board of health costs of dairy farm inspections made after December 31, 1960.

Provincial legislation calls for the establishment of local boards of health to administer health measures. A local board of health directs the staffs of a local health department and at the same time acts as a standing committee of a local council on health matters. As an alternative, municipalities may join in the formation of joint county health units. In the Metropolitan Toronto area only East York and Leaside have taken advantage of provincial legislation to form such a health unit. The other eleven municipalities have boards of health and permanent and part-time employees working under them. Thus there are twelve health departments, which are directed by permanent or part-time Medical Officers of Health.

QUESTION 3: BOARD REMUNERATION

For 1960 five health departments reported payments to members of local health boards as follows: North York: $265; Scarborough: $497; Etobicoke: $800; York: $513; East York - Leaside: $630. The amounts reported totalled $2705.

QUESTION 4: ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND EMPLOYEES

While there is much similarity in the divisional organization of health departments in the different municipalities, some arbitrary assignments have had to be made in preparing the following table 1, which presents the picture of health department establishments for 1960 as reported in the questionnaires. In some cases the establishment was not complete at the end of 1960, so that the figure for employees may not agree with the figure for employees at the end of 1960 reported for question 7. There is a further problem of what employees were reported for the different health departments.

Many health personnel are "permanent" employees, but only on a part-time basis. There are also temporary employees, many of whom also work on a part-time basis. Because many such employees work in the schools they would not necessarily be reported for December 31, 1960.

For Scarborough, the figure shown of 60 full time employees was the actual strength of the department; the establishment called for an additional assistant M.O.H., an additional supervisor of nurses and three additional sanitary inspectors, to make up the complete establishment of 65.

TABLE 1: HEALTH DEPARTMENTS

ESTABLISHMENTS BY DIVISIONS FOR 1960

Municipality	Medical Officer of Health	Deputy M.O.H. or Assistant	Chief Sanitary Inspector or Other	Sanitary Inspection Staff	Nursing	Dental	Medical and Disease Control	Mental Health	Administration and Clerical	Total Personnel
City of Toronto										
Full Time	1	1	1	85	230	19	60	15	77*	489
Part Time					16	60	22			98
Total	1	1	1	85	246	79	82	15	77*	587
North York										
Full Time	1	1	1	11	34	12			9	69
Part Time					7	29				36
Total	1	1	1	11	41	41			9	105
Scarborough										
Full Time	1	1	1	5	36	3			13	60
Part Time					4					4
Total	1	1	1	5	40	3			13	64
Etobicoke										
Full Time	1	1	1	6	34				7	50
Part Time							7			7
Total	1	1	1	6	34		7		7	57
York										
Full Time	1		1	2	30	2	1	5	4	46
Part Time					1	9	6	1		17
Total	1		1	2	31	11	7	6	4	63
East York-Leaside										
Full Time	1		1	2	21				6	31
Part Time		1			3	3	14		1	22
Total	1	1	1	2	24	3	14		7	53
Forest Hill										
Full Time			Building, Etc. Inspector		4					4
Total	1				7	1	2			11
Mimico										
Part Time	1		Building, Etc. Inspector		3					4
New Toronto										
Full Time			Building, Etc. Inspector		1					1
Total	1				3					4
Long Branch										
Full Time			Building, Etc. Inspector		1					1
Total	1				3					4
Weston										
Full Time			Building, Etc. Inspector		3					3
Total	1				3					4
Swansea										
Full Time					1					1
Total	1		1		2				1	5
Totals										
Full Time	6	4	6	111	395	36	61	20	116	755
Part Time	6	1	1		42	102	51	1	2	206
Totals	12	5	7	111	433	138	112	21	118	961

* Included in the City of Toronto Head Office Section are 38 Ambulance Drivers, 4 Ambulance Dispatchers and 1 Ambulance Supervisor.

QUESTION 5: SALARIES OF HEADS

As indicated in Table 1 only half the Medical Officers of Health are on a more or less permanent basis. The East York - Leaside Health Unit makes special arrangements with the School of Hygiene of the University of Toronto for the services of its Director and Medical Officer of Health and of its Assistant Medical Officer of Health. Remuneration in the twelve health departments is as follows:

Municipality	Salary of Medical Officer of Health	Salary of Deputy or Assistant Medical Officer of Health
	$	$
Toronto	14,900	12,400
North York	13,313	10,059
Scarborough	12,500	10,500
Etobicoke	13,800	9,730
York	11,700	
East York - Leaside	7,700	2,000
Forest Hill	2,156	
Mimico	1,300	
New Toronto	1,500	
Long Branch	1,000	
Weston	2,000	
Swansea	2,000	

QUESTIONS 6 and 7: SALARIES AND STAFF - 1952 to 1960.

QUESTION 8: EXPLANATIONS OF INCREASES AND DECREASES IN STAFF

Table 2 gives staffs and salaries as reported for health departments from 1952 to 1960. North York noted that employment records for 1952 to 1958 were not available in the Health Department. York Township reported both a minimum and a maximum figure for employment in each of the years. The explanations given in answers to question 8 indicate that changes in responsibilities of the health departments help to explain the limited range of changes in employment during this period.

TABLE 2. HEALTH DEPARTMENTS - SALARIES AND STAFF. 1952 to 1960. First line - Number of Employees. Second line - Salaries and Wages

Municipality	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
City of Toronto	581 1,956,887	683 1,994,326	702 2,030,719	673 2,154,686	681 2,220,629	584 2,049,956	581 2,136,816	588 2,248,279	587 2,330,694
North York	104,052	121,402	150,509	193,274	234,298	286,147	312,993	85 312,402	105 333,239
Scarborough	14 33,369	15 42,273	22 55,505	32 80,523	40 120,769	48 148,399	50 180,340	54 280,166	64 249,371
Etobicoke	21 47,055	24 58,114	32 77,752	38 87,020	43 119,445	45 143,265	49 155,353	52 163,943	55 188,450
York (Min-Max)	17-21 57,806	16-20 61,759	16-19 56,673	16-20 61,305	20-26 76,056	31-40 121,103	38-51 168,416	40-54 182,381	44-64 212,483
East York - Leaside	42 87,609	41 88,768	51 91,721	62 101,213	67 108,973	68 119,258	59 119,528	53 125,998	53 126,724
Forest Hill	12 9,448	13 12,175	15 15,143	13 13,369	13 21,629	14 22,166	13 23,075	14 22,932	11 23,714
Mimico	3 2,846	3 3,552	3 4,222	3 4,742	3 4,701	3 6,080	4 5,742	4 6,157	4 7,744
New Toronto	3 8,100	3 8,790	3 9,600	3 8,465	3 9,223	3 10,630	3 11,028	3 11,649	4 13,248
Long Branch	3 4,016	3 4,368	4 4,922	4 5,508	4 5,686	4 6,719	4 8,751	4 8,221	4 8,526
Weston	4 8,819	4 9,481	4 9,800	5 11,381	5 13,529	5 12,946	5 13,458	5 14,556	5 14,300
Swansea	5 5,227	5 5,408	5 6,051	5 6,496	5 6,989	5 7,406	5 7,862	5 8,197	5 8,837
Total Staff excluding North York Total Salaries	805-809 2,325,234	810-814 2,410,421	857-860 2,512,617	854-858 2,738,982	884-890 2,941,927	810-819 2,934,075	811-824 3,143,362	822-836 3,384,881	836-856 3,517,330

When Metropolitan Toronto took over the Riverdale Isolation Hospital in 1957 it meant a transfer of 102 employees from the City. Before that time a reduced workload at the Isolation Hospital had allowed a reduction in staff. The City of Toronto also "lost" some employees when the Property and Building Departments took over responsibility for maintenance of some buildings and control over plumbing inspection, respectively. In both Toronto and suburban municipalities large scale immunization programmes (polio especially) account for some variation in staff. In most of the suburbs the increase in staff is explained by the increase in population, especially in school population, but also by increases in the provision of health services. The availability of personnel has also affected the total employed.

During the year employment by health departments varies according to school needs. Thus maximum employment occurs during school periods and minimum during school vacations. While department of health public health nurses carry on testing and immunization programmes among school children, school boards may also employ their own nurses to check on the everyday health of pupils. On some of the questionnaires it was indicated that part of the salaries of public health nurses was paid by a school board.

QUESTIONS 9 and 10: TOTAL EXPENDITURES

A board of health may approve payments to outside personnel and firms for services which may be provided directly by health department personnel in another municipality. Payments to other physicians participating in a school health programme, or to nurses at child health centres are examples of the first, and payments for ambulances an example of the second. (The City of Toronto maintains a Public Health Ambulance Service.) Where special expenditures of this nature were noted in the questionnaire they were segregated and are described in detail herewith. In the salaries reported in Table 2 for the City of Toronto there was provision for the following services:

Chest Clinics - 26 Physicians	$11,600
Child Health Centres - 38 Physicians	$23,500
- 45 V.O.N.'s	$17,000
	$52,100

In other municipalities such special services were often reported with expenditures other than salaries and wages.

City of Toronto		
Taxi service - transportation of indigent patients to and from hospital:		$13,383
North York		
School Health services - hiring of extra doctors:		$ 9,000
Scarborough		
Nursing services at Child Health Centre Clinics:		
Victoria Order of Nurses	$1,080	
St. Elizabeth Nurses	$1,035	
	$2,115	
Doctors' Time at Immunization Clinics, Child Health Centres, School Physical Examinations, etc:	$6,535	
		$8,650
Etobicoke		
Payments to Weston re Etobicoke children attending Weston Schools:	$1,326	
Ambulance:	$14,361	
		$15,687
York		
Fees for professional services:		$ 147
Forest Hill		
Ambulance:		$ 110
Mimico		
Rodent control:	$ 100	
Dental Survey for Separate School:	$ 60	
		$ 160
New Toronto		
Rat control:		$ 57
Weston		
Welfare Cases - Dental:	$ 287	
- Medical:	$ 50	
		$ 337
Swansea		
Dental:		$ 120
		$47,651

TABLE 3: HEALTH DEPARTMENTS - TOTAL EXPENDITURES IN 1960

Municipality	Salaries and Wages	Special Expenditures	Other Expenditures	Total Expenditures $	Total Expenditures Per Capita	Assessed Population
City of Toronto	2,330,694	13,383	478,963	2,823,040	4.38	644,948
North York	333,239	9,000	97,323	439,562	1.77	247,764
Scarborough	249,371	8,650	52,759	310,780	1.56	198,724
Etobicoke	188,450	15,687	51,534	255,671	1.75	145,847
York	212,483	147	14,820	227,450	1.83	124,195
East York - Leaside	126,724	-	29,649	156,373	1.82	86,018
Forest Hill	23,714	110	2,515	26,339	1.29	20,386
Mimico	7,744	160	733	8,637	.53	16,442
New Toronto	13,248	57	2,272	15,577	1.20	12,941
Long Branch	8,526	-	380	8,906	.83	10,783
Weston	14,300	337	1,864	16,501	1.73	9,535
Swansea	8,837	120	1,515	10,472	1.10	9,522
Totals	3,517,330	47,651	734,327	4,299,308	2.82	1,527,105

Table 3 is a summary table by municipality of all expenditures reported for health, together with per capita total expenditures. "Other expenditures" covers a variety of expenditures, including medical and dental supplies, transportation costs and car allowances, and public information. Some of these expenditures are directly related to the salaries and wages of permanent employees, such as employer's contributions to pension funds, and cumulative sick pay grants. For the City of Toronto estimates of such payments by the municipality for pensions, the Ontario Hospital Plan, Unemployment Insurance, and administrative costs of Workmen's Compensation were provided by the Treasury Department of the City of Toronto.

TABLE 4. HEALTH DEPARTMENTS - PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY FUNCTIONS

Municipality	Admin. & Clerical	Sanitary Inspection	Nursing	Dental	Medical & Disease Control	Mental Health
City of Toronto	14.5[1]	14.8	41.2	11.2	15.7	2.6
North York	10.0	14.0	23.0	28.0	25.0[2]	
Scarborough	10.0	8.0	62.0	8.0	12.0	
Etobicoke	11.0	20.0	54.0		15.0	
York	7.0	6.6	59.0	15.4	7.6	4.4
East York-Leaside	17.4	10.3	59.2	3.3	9.8	
Forest Hill	13.9	8.4	57.2	9.9	10.6	
Mimico	1.0	37.0	44.0	1.0	17.0	
New Toronto	14.0	not reported	33.0	35.0	18.0	
Long Branch		11.0	76.0		13.0	
Weston		3.0	73.0		24.0	
Swansea		10.0	60.0		30.0	

1. Includes 7.4% for Ambulance Service.
2. Includes 23.0% shown as School Health Service.

QUESTION 10: FUNCTIONS

The percentage distribution of expenditures by function is shown in Table 4. In the smallest municipalities administration costs may be included in the other functions shown, but also some of the overhead may be absorbed by the clerk's or general office department which handles much of the ordinary work of many municipal functions. Whether the remuneration to Medical Officers of Health is included with Administration or with Medical is not known.

QUESTION 11: DUPLICATION

Question 11 was not answered by five of the health departments, and the other seven indicated no duplication, as shown in the following table.

Municipality	No Duplication	Not Answered
Toronto		x
North York	x	
Scarborough	x	
Etobicoke		x
York	x	
East York - Leaside		x
Forest Hill	x	
Mimico	x	
New Toronto	x	
Long Branch		x
Weston		x
Swansea	x	
	7	5

York Township noted: "Amalgamation would change the present set-up very little. York Township would become one area of the Metropolitan Health Department".

CHAPTER 22

OTHER LOCAL DEPARTMENTS

This chapter deals with the City of Toronto Purchasing and Stores Division, the Toronto Historical Board, the North York By-law Enforcement and License Department and the Lifesaving Activities of the Toronto Harbour Commissioners. Separate summaries have not been prepared for any of these; the significant information will be included in the following discussion.

City of Toronto Purchasing and Stores Division

As noted in Chapter 16 the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto makes considerable use of the services of the Purchasing and Stores Division and of the City's Fair Wage Officer who is attached to this Division. The Division acts as purchasing agent, standardizing commodities in use by more than one department and inspecting purchases to assure that they conform to specifications. It also operates a central stores organization, and maintains perpetual inventory controls. In 1960 the division's staff numbered 63, with salaries totalling $247,000 and total operating expenditures including salaries of about $275,000. Over 50,000 purchase orders were processed, and stores to a value of nearly $1,800,000 were issued.

Considering the possible effect of amalgamation on the Division, it is very probable that an amalgamated administration would find it beneficial to operate a central purchasing and stores agency to supply all departments. If this should be the case then the present role of the purchasing and stores division would be greatly expanded under amalgamation. The full effects of this could not be gauged without further investigation.

Toronto Historical Board

The function of the Board is to construct, maintain and manage historic sites and properties owned or acquired by the City. Its 1960 staff totalled 4 permanent employees, with an additional temporary staff of 25 employed during the summer months. Its total 1960 expenditure came to about $58,000.

It seems probable that under amalgamation the Board would be maintained and its jurisdiction extended to cover the entire Metropolitan area. While this broader jurisdiction would undoubtedly tend to increase the expenditures of the Board, this would have to be weighed against the potential advantages as regards the preservation, restoration and operation for the public of historical sites in the suburbs.

North York By-law Enforcement and License Department

This Department is charged with enforcing by-laws (a considerable part of this responsibility involves enforcement of zoning by-laws), issuing licenses (mainly dog licenses), operating the dog pound, and operating parking meters. Its 1960 staff totalled 11, and its expenditures came to about $65,000.

While in other municipalities, similar functions are performed by other departments, the question arises, whether under amalgamation, by-law enforcement might not be found important enough to require a separate department to deal with it.

Life-Saving Activities of the Toronto Harbour Commissioners

In 1960 the cost of the life-saving service provided by the Commissioners was approximately $275,000. There were 32 permanent employees, and during the summer, 20 extra crewmen and 112 lifeguards were employed on life-saving operations. Over 4,000 boat controls were made, nearly 500 persons were rescued and nearly 700 first aid cases treated during 1960. The service provided is obviously an essential one, which would have to be continued under amalgamation, and the question arises, whether it would not in fact require expansion so as to serve the entire Metropolitan waterfront. A related question is the provision of lifeguard service at swimming pools throughout the Metropolitan area; evidently the City of Toronto uses the Harbour Commissioners' lifeguard service for this purpose, but in the suburbs the service evidently comes under Parks or Recreation Departments. Perhaps the fundamental question is whether life-saving is properly a function of Harbour Control, Recreational Programmes or Policing.

Further study would certainly be required before the best manner of providing such services under amalgamation could be determined.

PART IV

METROPOLITAN DEPARTMENTS HAVING NO LOCAL COUNTERPARTS

PART FOUR

METROPOLITAN DEPARTMENTS HAVING NO LOCAL COUNTERPARTS

CHAPTER 23

METROPOLITAN TORONTO ASSESSMENT DEPARTMENT

While it would be natural to think that departments such as assessment which are already amalgamated would not be further affected by amalgamation, it is possible that elimination of separate local governments, reduction in the number of local departments, or other changes which would result from amalgamation might affect their workload. Accordingly each of these purely Metropolitan departments was asked to indicate whether amalgamation would be expected to have any effect upon the department for any of the following or other reasons:

(1) Due to the elimination of numerous local governments with which the department may currently have dealings.

(2) Due to the elimination of local boundaries which must be respected when providing service.

(3) Due to extension of the service which the department provides from the Metropolitan to the local levels.

(4) Due to growth of other Metropolitan departments which this department serves.

In reply to this enquiry the Assessment Department indicated that there is some time lost in dealing with thirteen individual municipal administrations, namely with respect to the various Clerks and Courts of Revision, and in addition, the problem of watching closely the varied policies which exist in regard to building, zoning and other by-laws also adds to the Department's workload. While amalgamation would reduce the Department's workload in these respects, it was noted that the difficulties could be equally overcome by amendments to the present Act governing the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

The summary of information on the Assessment Department follows on the next page.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION
ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO
ASSESSMENT DEPARTMENT

ASSESSMENT DEPARTMENT STAFF AND SALARIES
IN 1953

Area Municipality	No. of Employees	Salaries
Toronto	156	511,768
North York	15	42,882
York	11	34,465
Etobicoke	14*	46,004
Scarborough	13	42,800
East York	7*	19,027
Forest Hill	3	10,781
Leaside	1	3,700
New Toronto	2	9,100
Mimico	1*	4,004
Swansea	1	3,800
Weston	1*	4,100
Long Branch	2	6,000
TOTAL	227	738,431

* - Plus additional staff employed part time as required.

Staff and Salaries, 1954 - 1960

Year	Permanent Establishment	Additional Temporary	Total Employees	Salaries $	Commissioner $	Deputy $
1954	252	209	461	1,281,296	15,000	9,000
1955	252	310	562	1,434,657	16,800	9,000
1956	252	305	557	1,454,027	17,600	9,000
1957	260	147	407	1,308,541	18,400	9,500
1958	315	91	406	1,454,165	19,200	9,500
1959	315	95	410	1,522,242	21,000	10,500
1960	315	109	424	1,647,740	22,000	10,500

1960 Current Expenditures for
Operation of Department other than wages and Salaries

Expenditures for Operation of Department	Expenditures for Services of Private Firms etc.	Total Expenditures other than Wages and Salaries
$244,154	$1,275	$245,429

TOTAL, All 1960 Expenditures:	Salaries	$1,647,740.
	Other than Salaries	245,429.
		$1,893,169.

Inasmuch as there is only one Assessment Department for the Metropolitan Area, what might be assumed by the use of the word 'overlapping' does not really exist. There is, however, some time lost in dealing with thirteen individual municipal administrations, namely with respect to the various Clerks and Courts of Revision and in addition, the problem of watching closely the varied policies which exist in regard to building, zoning and other by-laws.

It should be pointed out, however, that the difficulties to which we refer here can be equally overcome by amendments to the present Act governing the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto just as well as by amalgamation or annexation of the thirteen municipalities.

CHAPTER 24

METROPOLITAN TORONTO COURTS OF REVISION

In reply to the enquiry as to whether amalgamation would have any effects upon the Courts of Revision, the following statement was submitted:

(1) It is now the procedure to hold Courts of Revision within the boundaries of each Metropolitan municipality to hear appeals pertaining to that particular area. If the numerous local governments were eliminated, courts could be arranged at strategic points within the Metropolitan area, possibly along the lines of the existing divisional areas established by the Assessment Department, for instance the three Lakeshore municipalities combining with Etobicoke.

(2) With the elimination of local boundaries it is possible that the number of courts required could be reduced by reason of the fact that courts with a limited number of appeals, as in the case of the smaller municipalities, could be combined with other courts which should result in some saving of expenditures for this purpose.

(3) It is not anticipated that any extension of service would be necessary.

(4) Growth of other departments would not have any effect on the operation of this department unless there should be any major change or extended programme of reassessment which would result in an abnormal number of appeals to the Courts of Revision.

The summary of information on the Courts of Revision follows on the next page.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO COURTS OF REVISION

Year	Staff and Salaries		
	Permanent	Temporary	Total
1954	2 $ 11,199	-	2 $ 11,199
1955	2 12,545	387	2 12,932
1956	2 13,704	635	2 14,339
1957	2 14,784	1,244	2 16,028
1958	2 15,475	934	2 16,409
1959	2 16,682	1,215	2 17,896
1960	2 17,430	1,403	2 18,733

1960 Salary of Commissioner and Coordinating Officer	$13,000
Total 1960 expenditures other than wages and salaries	$12,734

Total, all 1960 expenditures:	Salaries	$18,733
	Other than salaries	12,734
	Total	$31,467

DEPARTMENT OF CO-ORDINATING OFFICER

Functions

(1) To arrange all sittings of Courts of Revision for all Assessment appeals in each and all municipalities in the Metropolitan area.

(2) To appoint Commissioners to preside at all sittings of the Court of Revision within the Metropolitan area.

(3) To keep adequate records of the number of Courts held, all correspondence in connection therewith and the costs involved.

Volume of Work

This depends primarily on the number of appeals to be heard or dealt with in any given period. The number would vary from year to year according to the economic conditions prevailing at that time. The records for the years 1955 to 1960 inclusive are as follows:

Year	Number of Sittings	Number of Appeals - Other than Section 51, 51A, 124 and 236 of The Assessment Act, and appeals under the Local Improvement Act.
1955	744	) Periods overlapped.
1956	841	) No complete record available.
1957	690	)
1958	587	25,898
1959	597	22,431
1960	567	26,804

Overlapping of Services

As the work of the Court of Revision is closely associated with that of the Assessment Department which does operate on a Metropolitan basis, there is no actual overlapping of services in this department other than the secretarial work which necessitates us dealing with 13 different clerks for the Courts in each municipality.

However, it might be pointed out that it is now a requirement under the Act that each and every municipality hold sittings of the Court of Revision within its own boundaries effecting the ratepayers on their assessment rolls. It is possible that with one Court of Revision for the entire Metropolitan area, some Courts could be consolidated so as to process appeals from more than one area municipality at the same sitting when it is opportune for additional appeals to be heard and the location of the court not too inconvenient to appellants who wish to appear.

It is conceivable that if such a change was made there would be a reduction in the number of sittings required to deal with the overall total of appeals with a consequent reduction in costs and result in some savings being made in the operation of this department.

CHAPTER 25

METROPOLITAN TORONTO EMERGENCY MEASURES ORGANIZATION

In 1960, this Organization was known as the Metropolitan Toronto Civil Defence Organization. The following comments were received from the present E.M.O. co-ordinator.

The effect of amalgamation upon the Metropolitan Toronto Emergency Measures Organization must be considered in the light of this Organization's relationship to other Metropolitan and Municipal departments both in the regular training and public education programme and any disaster situation which would involve the operation of this Organization.

By-Law 110, an act to amend the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, provides in Section 13, Sub-section 8, that by-laws passed for Emergency Measures purposes will be in force in the Metropolitan Area. Thus, provision is made in the act for a co-ordinated programme which has effect in the present Metropolitan Toronto structure.

Necessary liaison of this Organization with the Metropolitan Toronto Police Department on emergency matters is facilitated due to the existence of one unified force. The Fire Departments of the thirteen municipalities create, under present circumstances, a somewhat more extensive administrative problem. Training of the municipal fire departments for emergency measures purposes must necessarily be co-ordinated through this Organization and requires more extensive liaison than that with the Metropolitan Toronto Police Force.

To summarize, amalgamation might assist in facilitating the implementation of this Organization's Departmental training programme in some ways. The legislative authority insofar as this Organization is concerned may well achieve a similar result. Regardless of amalgamation, it must be anticipated that the staff of this Organization will increase somewhat in the near future due to its increased responsibilities and commitments.

The summary of information for 1960 and previous years on the Organization follows on the next page.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION ON METROPOLITAN
TORONTO CIVIL DEFENCE ORGANIZATION

(1)

Year	Staff	Salaries $
1955	12	15,823
1956	16	57,797
1957	18	63,661
1958	24	95,469
1959	23	107,417
1960	23	114,132

Included in above - 1960 salary of: Co-ordinator $ 4,598
Deputy Co-ordinator $ 7,022

(2) 1960 Non-salary Expenditures

For Operation of Department	For Services of Private Firms etc.	Total
$49,797	-	$49,797

(3) Total, all 1960 expenditures:

salaries	$114,132
other than salaries	49,797
Total	$163,929

CHAPTER 26

METROPOLITAN TORONTO JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT

As in the case of the Magistrates' Court, it would not be expected that amalgamation would have any effect upon the Juvenile and Family Court.

The summary follows on the next page.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION ON METROPOLITAN
TORONTO JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT

(1)

Year	Wages and Salaries paid during Year		
	Permanent	Temporary	Total
	$	$	$
1952	63,006.00	31,880.00	94,886.00
1953	74,029.00	37,900.00	111,929.00
1954	101,451.00	48,657.00	150,108.00
1955	156,144.00	53,548.00	209,692.00
1956	164,290.00	82,902.00	247,192.00
1957	195,005.00	97,001.00	292,006.00
1958	258,286.00	68,711.00	326,997.00
1959	285,958.00	50,500.00	336,458.00
1960	377,801.00	58,500.00	436,301.00

Note: From 1954 on, figures include the County of York Court operations.

(2)

Year	Number Employed on December 31st.		
	Permanent	Temporary	Total
1952	20	10	30
1953	20	12	32
1954	26	13	39
1955	36	20	56
1956	41	21	62
1957	54	27	81
1958	63	29	92
1959	73	20	93
1960	82	19	101

Note: From 1954 on, figures include the County of York Court operations.

(3)

Year 1960.

Total expenditures including salaries	$508,601.00
Total expenditures for services of private firms etc.	Nil
Grand total of all non-salary expenditures	$72,300.00

CHAPTER 27

METROPOLITAN TORONTO LICENSING COMMISSION

In reply to the enquiry as to whether amalgamation would be expected to have any effects upon the Licensing Commission, the following statement was received:

(1) New license applications involving premises and zoning regulations are at present referred to the Clerks of municipalities in all cases excepting the City of Toronto. They are asked if the application is contrary to zoning by-laws; if the council is in accord with the granting of the license, and if not to give reasons. In the case of the City of Toronto such applications are referred to department heads.

It is obvious that the procedure of referring to local councils would be amended in case of amalgamation, and the practice now in vogue in Toronto would prevail.

(2) The elimination of local boundaries would have little effect except that some municipalities are more restrictive than others at present and this would naturally disappear.

The summary of information on the Licensing Commission follows on the next page.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION ON METROPOLITAN LICENSING COMMISSION

STAFF AND SALARIES, 1957 - 1960

1957 (1st full year)	Number of Employees	Total Salary and Wage Costs	
Permanent	44	$ 129,800.00	
Temporary	9	27,800.00	
*Examining Boards	8	4,000.00	
Commission Members	3	16,000.00	177,600.00
	64		
1958			
Permanent	49	167,000.00	
Temporary	4	13,500.00	
*Examining Boards	8	3,600.00	
Commission Members	3	15,700.00	199,800.00
	64		
1959			
Permanent	49	186,700.00	
Temporary	1	3,300.00	
*Examining Boards	8	3,600.00	
Commission Members	3	17,000.00	210,600.00
	61		
1960			
Permanent	56	215,400.00	
Temporary	1	2,300.00	
*Examining Boards	8	3,400.00	
Commission Members	3	17,000.00	238,100.00
	68		
			826,100.00

1959 - Difficulty encountered in securing replacements for 3 positions.

1960 - Permanent establishment increased by 5 Inspectors and 2 positions vacant during 1959 were filled.

* Ancillary Members

The Metropolitan Licensing system, during the year 1960 issued 58,514 licenses to 84 different categories, totalling $787,749.25 for an actual expenditure of $324,755.00.

CHAPTER 28

METROPOLITAN TORONTO MAGISTRATES' COURT

In reply to the enquiry as to whether amalgamation would be expected to have any effects upon Magistrates' Courts, it was stated that amalgamation would be expected to have no effects upon the Courts' functions.

The summary follows on the next page.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO MAGISTRATES' COURT

Senior Magistrate T.S. Elmore, Q.C.,

appointed by Provincial Government, Annual Salary - $12,500

Administrator appointed by Metropolitan

Corporation, Annual Salary - 12,000

STAFF AND SALARIES, 1954 - 1960

Year	Number of Employees	Salary and Wage Costs
1954	65	$265,988
1955	66	279,298
1956	66	313,180
1957	173	705,887
1958	178	744,475
1959	174	781,996
1960	176	855,972

1960 Non-Salary Expenditures

For operation of Department	For Services of Private Firms etc.	Total
$254,911.	$4,533.	$259,444

Total, all 1960 expenditures:	Salaries	$855,972
	Other than Salaries	259,444
	Total	$1,115,416

Volume of work for 1960 is indicated as follows:

Minor Traffic charges dealt with		310,501
All other cases dealt with		75,023
	Total:	385,524
Total parking tags processed		775,218
Civil Marriages performed		1,431

There is no overlapping of the functions of this Department in view of the fact that the Magistrates' Courts of Metropolitan Toronto were amalgamated into one body as of January 1, 1957.

CHAPTER 29

METROPOLITAN TORONTO BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF POLICE

In reply to the enquiry as to whether amalgamation would be expected to have any effect upon the services provided by the Metropolitan Toronto Police, the following statement was received:

(1) The elimination of the various local governments would eventually result in the elimination of the present complexity of by-laws. This would provide a greater ease of assignment of personnel, and would correct much of the existing confusion of the enforcement of local by-laws.

(2) The elimination of local boundaries would not have any effect since the organization of the Metropolitan force has been designed solely to provide better police services irrespective of boundaries.

(3) The extension of the services of the Metropolitan Toronto Police throughout the area of Metropolitan Toronto will only result from growth in terms of population, buildings, roads, vehicular traffic, parks, criminal occurrences and increases in responsibilities as the result of legislative action at the Federal, Provincial or Municipal level.

The summary of information on the Police Commission follows on the next page.

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION
ON METROPOLITAN TORONTO
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF POLICE

As of January 1st, 1957, the total strength of the thirteen departments was 85 below authorized strength. The undernoted figures show the growth of the Department since its inception as a Metropolitan Force.

	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Uniform	1985	2050	2107	2146	2243
Civilian	209	241*	268x	316@	425#
School Guards	448	453	458	462	465
Totals	2632	2744	2833	2924	3133

Note: * incl. 19 Cadets, x incl. 34 cadets, @ incl. 66 Cadets, # incl. 105 Cadets.

The addition of new Squads and Bureaux in addition to the provision of Senior Officers on duty at all times, in particular areas, has increased the number of ranking Officers in accordance with the table below:

	Dec. 31, 1956	March 1, 1961
Chiefs of Police	13	1
Deputy Chiefs	5	4
Chief of Detectives	1	-
Ass't Chief of Detectives	1	-
District Chiefs	-	5
Chief Inspector	1	-
Staff Inspector	5	12
Inspectors	42	54*
Chief Identification Officer	1	-
	69	76

* includes an Acting Inspector delegated as liaison Officer between the Metropolitan Police and the Emergencies Measure Organization, (Civilian Defence).

Increases in the costs of Police Services since and including the year 1956 are tabulated below, with a breakdown showing salary increases in each year, and increases in all other appropriations for the corresponding years.

SALARIES

	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
City	$6,581,344				
Areas	3,174,185				
Total	$9,755,529	$10,302,160	$11,160,398	$12,081,512	$13,307,757

ALL OTHER APPROPRIATIONS

City	$1,213,570				
Areas	696,933				
Total	$1,910,503	$ 2,357,859	$ 2,285,867	$ 2,524,533	$ 2,796,909

TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS

City	$ 7,794,914				
Areas	$ 3,871,118				
Total	$11,666,032	$12,660,019	$13,446,265	$14,606,045	$16,104,666

CONTROLLABLE EXPENDITURES

(including Office Supplies, Rental of Buildings & Mtc., Fuel, light and water, Motor Vehicles, Clothing & Equipment, Communications, etc.)

1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
$1,072,296	$1,553,581	$1,371,783	$1,553,789	$1,674,549

UNCONTROLLABLE EXPENDITURES

(including Salaries, Pension Contributions, Hospitalization Contributions & Insurance)

$10,593,736	$11,106,438	$12,074,482	$13,052,256	$14,430,117

Increase in Controllable Expenditures from 1956 to 1960 - $602,253
Increase in Uncontrollable Expenditures from 1956 to 1960 -$3,836,381

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

GENERAL DATA ON LAND AREA, POPULATION AND ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX I

GENERAL DATA

1. LAND AREA AS OF DECEMBER 31, 1960.

Municipality	Ward	Area In Acres
Toronto	1	2,477.6
	2	2,746.6
	3	1,399.6
	4	2,945.8
	5	2,277.5
	6	3,283.3
	7	1,692.3
	8	2,692.8
	9	2,810.0
		22,325.5
North York	1	10,331.0
	2	6,140.0
	3	4,968.0
	4	1,939.0
	5	5,185.0
	6	2,335.0
	7	11,008.0
	8	2,534.0
		44,440.0
York	1	769.1
	2	2,350.4
	3	952.7
	4	977.8
		5,050.0
Etobicoke	1	2,730.0
	2	3,968.0
	3	8,170.0
	4	12,867.0
		27,735.0
Scarborough	1	20,523.0
	2	3,533.0
	3	4,882.0
	4	1,249.0
	5	2,755.0
	6	12,070.0
		45,012.0

Municipality	Ward	Area in Acres
East York	-	3,776.0
Forest Hill	-	960.0
Leaside	-	1,152.0
New Toronto	-	768.0
Mimico	-	512.0
Swansea	-	640.0
Weston	-	640.0
Long Branch	-	576.0
Total for Metro	-	153,586.5

APPENDIX I

GENERAL DATA

2. POPULATION

Municipality	Ward	Population Compiled in: 1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Toronto	1	72,701	75,[illegible]	74,865	69,985	71,540	71,758	71,222	69,365
	2	65,570	67,119	66,151	60,840	[illegible],298	62,549	63,868	63,537
	3	45,999	44,729	42,207	39,438	40,010	40,980	40,348	40,013
	4	70,098	71,271	71,557	64,386	36,501	65,859	63,563	61,993
	5	90,480	93,899	94,757	88,024	1,660	90,196	90,151	88,544
	6	118,563	123,035	123,986	117,226	[illegible],898	120,926	120,578	119,770
	7	50,406	52,076	53,170	50,723	[illegible],802	51,788	51,114	50,800
	8	82,013	83,928	84,584	83,298	[illegible],601	82,926	81,925	81,535
	9	69,882	70,277	74,580	69,871	70,932	71,438	70,635	69,391
		665,902	682,419	681,857	643,791	[illegible],250	658,420	653,404	644,948
North York * (Original 4 Wards - Divided into 8 Wards in 1958)	1	29,222	34,513	39,130	46,495	33,515	17,478	24,965	31,212
	2	17,617	20,809	23,593	25,076	26,274	17,406	19,087	20,141
	3	13,110	15,477	17,547	18,069	18,058	46,043	48,222	50,447
	4	50,781	59,967	67,988	75,904	83,095	24,612	25,154	25,004
	5						25,455	29,466	31,460
	6						24,521	28,452	30,089
	7						25,136	31,501	36,496
	8						19,534	21,527	22,915
		110,730	130,766	148,258	165,544	182,942	200,185	228,374	247,764
York * (Ward 1 divided into Wards 1 & 4 in 1955)	1	52,140	55,375	28,250	27,291	28,607	29,503	29,261	29,241
	2	30,943	32,862	34,925	35,183	36,755	37,858	39,835	39,990
	3	17,380	18,458	19,705	19,880	20,484	20,949	21,309	21,169
	4			30,409	30,384	31,657	31,656	33,150	33,795
		100,463	106,695	113,289	113,368	117,503	119,966	123,555	124,195
Etobicoke *	1	19,399	21,757	23,190	23,343	24,362	24,582	25,001	25,454
	2	22,116	26,258	28,098	29,477	31,348	32,490	32,985	34,234
	3	19,707	24,415	28,646	30,776	33,638	36,621	41,790	44,137
	4	8,987	10,737	13,847	16,077	19,958	28,027	35,295	42,022
		70,209	83,167	93,781	99,673	114,306	121,720	135,071	145,847
Scarborough *	1	4,965	6,[illegible]	7,728	10,129	12,038	12,986	13,390	14,044
	2	15,855	19,255	23,625	27,995	31,238	32,971	34,168	35,118
	3	440	11,408	17,571	29,074	37,405	39,358	44,834	49,637
	4	14,335	17,4[illegible]	17,805	17,698	18,376	18,314	18,403	18,497
	5	20,875	25,35[illegible]	26,336	27,293	31,769	31,120	31,978	32,737
	6	13,333	16,1[illegible]	17,221	19,520	25,052	33,532	42,767	48,691
		70,803	95,705	110,286	131,709	151,885	168,281	185,540	198,724
East York	-	65,756	68,812	69,402	68,646	68,321	68,312	67,557	69,373
Forest Hill	-	17,719	18,664	19,139	19,785	[illegible],107	20,112	19,888	20,386
Leaside	-	15,910	16,87[illegible]	16,779	16,568	16,418	16,409	16,416	16,645
Long Branch	-	9,140	9,2[illegible]	9,632	9,890	10,532	11,026	10,728	10,783
Mimico	-	12,301	12,303	13,054	13,309	13,838	14,401	15,516	16,442
New Toronto	-	9,744	11,207	11,231	11,280	11,559	11,918	12,803	12,941
Swansea	-	8,[illegible]44	8,718	8,512	8,435	8,710	8,972	9,221	9,522
Weston	-	8,[illegible]74	8,569	9,143	9,330	[illegible]404	9,485	9,275	9,535
Total for Metro		1,172,[illegible]75	1,253,[illegible]4	1,3[illegible]4,[illegible]	1,31[illegible],136	[illegible],380,775	1,429,207	1,487,348	1,527,105

* - Totals not compiled by Ward in 1953. Ward Totals estimated on basis of 1954 percentages.

APPENDIX I

GENERAL DATA

3. TAXABLE ASSESSMENT

Municipality	Ward	Assessment made (for taxation in following year) in: 1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Toronto	1	122,[illegible]	124,743,172	125,065,218	125,389,447	1[illegible],176,764	131,004,128	132,417,071	132,777,139
	2	1[illegible],1[illegible],63	147,37[illegible],419	162,639,305	169,133,382	175,740,468	183,679,652	189,130,542	190,024,613
	3	156,[illegible]2,235	452,551,744	460,008,433	483,700,836	515,014,841	538,629,506	562,097,833	580,663,429
	4	18[illegible],545,[illegible]8	191,727,392	194,555,400	204,679,859	207,148,651	210,540,464	215,188,183	216,061,340
	5	1[illegible],4[illegible],[illegible]04	124,076,611	128,036,040	131,439,403	1[illegible],[illegible]0,269	132,935,695	135,339,213	136,731,346
	6	[illegible]7,[illegible]1,099	168,999,829	170,109,735	173,500,262	177,[illegible]53,683	182,212,176	185,148,609	190,702,662
	7	[illegible],873,802	88,694,711	89,661,594	91,434,326	[illegible],370,386	94,951,143	95,854,988	97,534,647
	8	1[illegible],951,285	105,723,720	107,612,208	107,522,771	1[illegible],[illegible]5,679	110,264,618	111,973,602	114,701,236
	9	[illegible],[illegible]1,[illegible]93	140,127,496	144,662,097	152,639,885	15[illegible],145,502	164,947,028	168,420,653	177,154,519
		1,5[illegible]7,68[illegible],950	1,544,023,094	1,583,350,910	1,639,440,171	1,5[illegible],536,943	1,749,164,410	1,795,570,694	1,836,350,931
North York * (Originally 4 Wards - Divided into 8 Wards in 1958)	1	[illegible]7,[illegible]0,14	85,305,001	112,918,913	129,182,117	1[illegible],[illegible],137	69,927,206	96,443,629	112,966,559
	2	[illegible]5,[illegible]02,708	31,927,727	38,748,447	41,609,587	[illegible],[illegible],523	58,307,437	65,276,761	68,574,898
	3	[illegible],355,117	33,640,183	38,310,231	39,754,527	40,[illegible]3,098	73,225,512	80,704,635	86,522,851
	4	[illegible],[illegible],265	107,065,322	147,519,748	168,492,962	1[illegible],767,808	54,676,919	56,215,416	58,416,610
	5						49,653,642	56,693,637	61,564,406
	6						67,687,656	73,531,221	79,884,172
	7						60,342,170	77,227,032	85,542,112
	8						41,723,159	47,057,110	49,698,737
		[illegible],[illegible]682,004	257,938,233	337,497,339	379,039,193	418,313,566	475,543,701	553,149,441	603,170,345
York * (Ward 1 divided into Wards 1 and 4 in 1955)	1	[illegible],725,058	85,921,196	44,304,395	45,324,281	46,5[illegible]2,838	48,494,814	49,351,284	49,932,997
	2	50,[illegible]4,931	54,131,105	59,290,351	62,249,045	65,283,186	69,868,785	75,168,698	76,077,217
	3	[illegible]7,609,815	29,354,208	31,497,331	32,394,695	[illegible],387,257	35,063,288	36,158,824	37,110,991
	4			47,224,944	48,513,385	[illegible],154,128	53,112,886	55,909,863	56,717,980
		158,[illegible]29,804	169,406,509	182,317,021	188,481,406	[illegible],[illegible]17,409	206,539,773	216,588,669	219,839,185
Etobicoke *	1	42,916,620	55,576,414	60,825,916	62,777,134	[illegible]4,551,881	66,209,169	68,476,902	69,600,103
	2	4[illegible],572,440	63,587,668	77,211,852	85,463,457	[illegible],014,727	98,708,720	105,614,042	113,792,467
	3	41,[illegible]58,040	54,190,533	68,990,959	80,178,160	3[illegible],013,693	97,795,555	107,632,290	118,092,277
	4	13,815,235	24,219,556	40,365,886	61,489,268	72,875,244	92,091,981	108,001,040	122,928,576
		132,552,385	197,574,171	247,394,613	289,908,019	320,455,545	354,805,425	389,724,274	424,413,423
Scarborough *	1	8,244,235	11,430,094	16,906,176	18,924,629	20,743,973	23,210,819	28,677,236	30,516,450
	2	3[illegible],854,[illegible]84	55,710,034	66,072,381	73,451,630	80,[illegible]56,996	90,157,483	93,736,110	99,900,098
	3	15,[illegible]4,407	18,352,714	37,359,084	44,558,927	5[illegible],344,353	63,982,287	73,563,207	83,251,704
	4	1[illegible],87[illegible],[illegible]59	23,423,419	26,348,887	31,658,327	32,580,817	31,245,965	31,852,948	32,313,825
	5	27,767,046	38,644,735	45,937,784	50,117,247	52,204,058	54,147,373	56,137,302	57,983,609
	6	19,044,553	26,454,484	31,661,662	42,024,606	47,6[illegible]7,612	63,232,207	77,684,437	86,222,720
		12[illegible],007,784	174,015,480	224,285,974	260,735,366	284,047,809	325,976,134	361,651,240	390,188,406
East York	-	[illegible],881,960	99,690,192	103,222,606	105,174,971	1[illegible],205,311	109,864,781	114,991,856	119,177,559
Forest Hill	-	4[illegible],572,[illegible]45	54,924,980	56,867,888	58,584,060	[illegible],754,418	62,208,343	63,660,108	66,095,589
Leaside	-	4[illegible],202,529	59,170,146	60,337,890	61,318,123	[illegible],[illegible]2,852	62,911,012	65,599,548	69,597,400
Long Branch	-	11,766,065	13,687,427	15,063,574	15,962,420	17,[illegible]02,801	17,333,942	17,801,894	18,146,356
Mimico	-	[illegible],[illegible]58,243	20,578,416	22,028,349	23,119,382	[illegible],009,147	26,197,509	28,078,080	31,248,421
New Toronto	-	28,529,560	34,113,126	34,801,336	35,361,348	35,561,575	39,834,694	41,940,525	42,659,832
Swansea	-	17,712,781	18,465,717	18,973,025	19,656,473	20,359,121	21,248,023	22,501,429	23,075,207
Weston	-	16,415,860	18,613,383	19,329,360	19,887,997	20,387,222	21,428,356	21,857,503	22,589,714
Total for Metro		2,431,592,974	2,662,200,874	2,905,469,885	3,096,668,929	3,2[illegible],133,699	3,473,056,103	3,693,195,261	3,966,552,368

* - Totals not compiled by Ward in 1955; ward totals estimated on basis of 1954 percentages.

APPENDIX 2

COPY OF QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THE STUDY

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO

THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL ON METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS

AREA MUNICIPALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION I

To be completed by the Clerk of the municipality.

1. Name of municipality _____.

2. Please indicate the structure of your 1960 Council:

	Number	How Elected	
		At Large	By Wards
Mayor			
Reeve			
Controllers			
Deputy Reeve (s)			
Aldermen			
Councillors			

3. Attach an organizational chart for your municipality, showing for 1960:

   (a) the full name, number of members and position in the administrative structure of each Council Committee;

   (b) the full name and position in the administrative structure of each Department operating directly under your Council or Council Committees;

   (c) the full name, number of members, and position in the administrative structure of each local Board, Commission, Authority, etc. which is supported in whole or part by your municipal tax levy.

   Please indicate any members of your 1960 Council, Council Committees, local Boards, Commissions, etc. who served on more than one of these bodies, listing the memberships held in each case.

4. Give the total 1960 salaries and other allowances paid to members of Council:

	Paid by the Municipality			Paid by a local Board, Commission, etc.	Total Paid
	For Council Duties	For Committee Duties	Total		
Mayor or Reeve					
Controllers or Deputy Reeve (s)					
Aldermen or Councillors					
Total all Members					

5. Give the 1960 current expenditures for any services performed directly for the Council or any of its Committees by private firms or organizations outside the municipal structure (e.g. service contracts, consulting services, etc.) Such services performed for one of your Departments, Boards, etc. should not be listed here, but in Section II of this Questionnaire. Do not include any capital expenditures, debenture debt charges, or rents. (If insufficient space attach additional sheet.)

Description of Service	Expenditure

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO

THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF THE
METROPOLITAN COUNCIL OF METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS

AREA MUNICIPALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION II

To be completed by the Head of each municipal Department and of each local Board, Commission, Authority, etc. which is supported in whole or in part by the municipal tax levy.

1. Name of municipality _____

2. Full name of Department, Board, Commission, etc. _____

3. If a Board, Commission, etc., give the total 1960 remuneration (including any allowances for travel and other expenses) paid to its members. $_____

4. Please attach an organizational chart for 1960 showing the administrative structure of the staff of the Department, Board, etc. The number of permanent and temporary (including casual) staff in each Staff Division and job classification should be indicated.

5. Give the full title and December 31st, 1960 salary rate of:

	Title	Salary
the administrative Head of the Department, Board, etc.		
the Deputy Head, or if there is no Deputy, the Division Heads		

6. Give total wage and salary expenditures in each of the years 1952 to 1960 for permanent and temporary (including casual) employees of the Department, Board, etc:

Year	Wages and Salaries paid during Year		
	Permanent	Temporary	Total
1952			
1953			
1954			
1955			
1956			
1957			
1958			
1959			
1960			

7. Give total number of permanent and temporary (including casual) employees of the Department, Board, etc. as of December 31st in each of the years 1952 to 1960:

Year	Number Employed on December 31st.		
	Permanent	Temporary	Total
1952			
1953			
1954			
1955			
1956			
1957			
1958			
1959			
1960			

8. Explain any increases or decreases from year to year in the total staff given in your answer to the previous question.

Years	Increase (+) or Decrease (-) in total staff	Explanation
1952-53		
1953-54		
1954-55		
1955-56		
1956-57		
1957-58		
1958-59		
1959-60		

9. Give the 1960 current expenditures for operation of the Department, Board, etc., other than wages and salaries. Indicate separately any expenditure for services performed by private firms or organizations outside the municipal structure (e.g. service contracts, consulting services, etc.) Do not include any capital expenditures, debenture debt charges, or rents paid for office space, etc.

Expenditures for Operation of Department		Expenditures for Services of Private Firms etc.		Total Expenditures other than Wages and Salaries
Description	Amount	Description of Service	Amount	

10. Describe each of the functions in 1960 of the Department, Board, etc.

Indicate the portion each function represents of total 1960 current expenditures for operation of the Department, Board, etc. ("wages and salaries" plus "other expenditures" as given in answers to questions 6 and 9 above). In the case of Boards, Commissions, etc., also give the number of meetings in 1960 of the Board, Commission, etc., and indicate the portion of the total 1960 meeting time spent on each function.

Indicate the 1960 workload for each function, using figures wherever possible, i.e. number of applications processed, permits issued, etc.

NOTE: In answering this question, the Audit, Clerk's, Legal, Parks, Planning, Property, Recreation, Roads, Traffic, Treasury, Welfare and Works Departments are each requested to use the categories set out in their respective sections of the appendix attached to this section of the Questionnaire.

The following table may be used in answering this question; if it does not provide sufficient space, attach additional sheets or provide the answers

on larger sheets but please follow the suggested layout:

Number of meetings in 1960 of Board, Commission, etc._____

Description of Function	% of total current expenditures for operation of Department, Board, etc.	% of Total Board or Commission Meeting Time	Workload
_____	_____	_____	_____

11. For each function performed by your Department, Board, etc. as given in the answer to question 10, indicate the degree to which you consider there is duplication or overlapping of work also being performed by one or more Metropolitan Departments or Boards or by one or more Departments or Boards in the Area Municipalities.

In indicating degree of duplication or overlapping, please indicate which Department (s) or Board (s) the overlapping occurs with, and use the following categories:

No duplication

a small amount of duplication

a moderate amount of duplication

a considerable amount of duplication

Please explain the nature of each work duplication, indicating whether in the future, if no amalgamation takes place, it seems likely to increase, decrease, or remain at its present level.

The following table may be used in answering this question; if insufficient space, attach additional sheets or provide the answers on larger sheets, but please follow the suggested layout:

Function	Degree of Duplication	Department(s) Involved	Nature of Duplication

12. To be answered only by Parks and/or Recreation Departments.

Parks Departments will answer all questions.

Parks and Recreation Departments will answer all questions.

Recreation Departments will answer those questions marked with an asterisk (*).

Please exclude all work done on Winter Works Incentive Programmes.

Definitions to be used:

Land development means development of land for park purposes including building of normal park buildings (shelters, concessions and toilets, etc.) but not including development of recreational facilities.

Development of specialized recreational facilities means development of facilities other than those outlined above (e.g. swimming pools, children's playgrounds, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, skating rinks, etc.)

General development includes both of above.

Equipment used for maintenance purposes means all equipment normally used by your department for maintaining park and/or recreation facilities (e.g. mowers, trucks, tractors, power saws, etc.) excluding hand tools. It does not include picnic tables, park benches, etc.

1. * What is the total acreage of land that is owned or falls under the jurisdiction of your Department?

_____

2. How is this land divided?

	No. of Areas	Total Acreage
a) Areas of more than 100 acres	_____	_____
b) Areas of more than 20 acres but less than 100	_____	_____
c) Areas of less than 20 acres	_____	_____
d) Volume of Street tree and roadside maintenance		_____

3. * Do you consider your parks and/or recreation system adequate? _____

4. * What was your total budget for 1960? _____

5. * Do you consider this adequate? _____

6. * If not, what do you consider adequate? _____

7. * Would you apply these additional funds and in what percentage to:

a) Land acquisition _____

b) Land development _____

c) Development of specialized recreational facilities _____

d) Maintenance _____

8. * Indicate in man weeks your staff breakdown for the period of November 1,1959 to March 31, 1960 in the following salary ranges:

	Permanent	Temporary	Casual
a) Less than $80. per week	_____	_____	_____
b) $80. - $90. per week	_____	_____	_____
c) Over $90. per week	_____	_____	_____

9. * As above for the period of April 1, 1960 to June 30, 1960:

a) Less than $80. per week	_____	_____	_____
b) $80. - $90. per week	_____	_____	_____
c) Over $90. per week	_____	_____	_____

10. * As above for the period of July 1, 1960 to August 31, 1960:

a) Less than $80. per week	_____	_____	_____
b) $80. - $90. per week	_____	_____	_____
c) Over $90. per week	_____	_____	_____

11. * As previously stated for the period of September 1, 1960 to October 31, 1960:

	Permanent	Temporary	Casual
a) Less than $80. per week	_____	_____	_____
b) $80. - $90. per week	_____	_____	_____
c) Over $90. per week	_____	_____	_____

12. * Total salaries as above:

Permanent	Temporary	Casual
_____	_____	_____

13. * Of this total, how much for head office administration? _____

14. What was the market value of greenhouses' production in 1960? _____

15. * Replacement value of equipment used for maintenance purposes as of December 31, 1960 _____

16. * 1960 Expenditure - Rental of Equipment _____

17. * 1960 Expenditure - Repairs to Equipment _____

18. * How many major Parks Dept. and/or Recreation depots do you operate? _____

19. Inventory of land acreage as of December 31st in each of the years:

1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

20. How much of this additional land was dedicated off Subdivision? _____

21. * Cost of land acquisition since January 1, 1956: _____

22. * Funds spent on General Development since January 1, 1956: _____

23. * Total maintenance costs for these years:

1956	1957	1958	1959	1960

24. Total value of Work Orders performed by your Department for these years:

1956	1957	1958	1959	1960

25. * Please list the following facilities owned by your Department as of December 31st in each of the years:

	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960
Swimming Pools						
Wading Pools						
Perm. Skating Rinks						
Temp. Skating Rinks						
Tennis Courts						
Children's Playgrounds						
Band Shells						
Bowling Greens						
Community Centres						
Arenas						
Soccer, Rugby & Football Fields						
Baseball Diamonds						

26. * Replacement value of parks and/or recreational facilities (excluding land costs) _____

27. * Do you have a backlog of underdeveloped land? _____

28. * If so, how much? _____

APPENDIX TO SECTION II OF AREA MUNICIPALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Categories to be used by Audit, Clerk's, Legal, Parks, Planning, Property, Recreation, Roads, Traffic, Treasury, Welfare and Works Departments in describing functions and workload in their answers to question 10, Section II of the Questionnaire.

It is requested that answers be given according to the following categories as set out for each of these Departments; additional categories may of course be used where required.

AUDIT

(A) The Audit Department of the City of Toronto:

To indicate functions:

(1) List statutory duties imposed on the City Auditor by:

(a) The City of Toronto Act;

(b) The Municipal Act (R.S.O. 1960) and regulations therefore;

(c) Any other Acts (R.S.O. 1960) and regulations therefore.

(2) List duties imposed on the City Auditor by City By-laws.

(3) List any other duties or functions.

(4) List all organizations of which an examination is made of the books and accounts.

To indicate workload:

(1) List by groups the allocation of audits assigned to separate divisions of the staff and the number of employees assigned to each group, accounting for the total employees in the Department.

(B) Auditing in the Area Municipalities other than the City of Toronto:

To be covered by Treasurers of the Area Municipalities in the Treasury Department Questionnaires. See notes on categories to be used under "TREASURY" below.

CLERK'S

To indicate functions, please refer to the following sections of the Department, indicating number of employees in each:

(1) General Administration (include Head and Deputy Head);

(2) Committee Secretary section;

(3) Clerical section;

(4) Elections and Court of Revision;

(5) Vital Statistics - Births, Marriages and Deaths;
- Marriage Licenses Issuance;

(6) Mailing Room (if applicable);

(7) Other sections - please specify.

NOTE: in Area Municipalities having no Legal Department, the Clerk's Department should attach to its questionnaire a statement showing for each of the years 1952 to 1960 inclusive:

(1) whether any solicitors were engaged for legal services during the year;

(2) if so, the amount paid for such services during the year;

(3) the nature of the legal services performed, and if the solicitor was given a written retainer, a list of the services to be performed under its terms.

A similar statement should also be attached to each questionnaire of a Board, Commission, etc. which engaged solicitors during any of these years.

Note that such legal services should also be included in the answers to question 5, Section I and question 9, Section II of all Questionnaires.

LEGAL

To indicate functions:

(1) List the bodies, other than the municipality itself, for which legal services are performed by the Department;

(2) Describe briefly the kinds of work done for the Municipality and for any other bodies served.

To indicate workload:

1 List (a) all bodies, committees, etc., the meetings of which are regularly attended by a representative of your Department and (b) those whose meetings are attended only on request.

2 Give the number of written legal opinions given by your Department in the course of the year.

3 Give the number of actions, appeals and similar contested proceedings completed by your Department during the year under the following headings:

(a) Division Court Actions

(b) County Court Actions

(c) Supreme Court Actions

(d) Land compensation arbitrations

(e) Assessment Appeals, Court of Revision

(f) Assessment Appeals, County Judge

LEGAL (continued)

(g) Assessment Appeals, Ontario Municipal Board;

(h) Motions other than interlocutory motions (e.g. to quash by-laws or for mandamus);

(i) Prosecutions for violation of By-laws, Magistrates' Court;

(j) Prosecutions for violation of By-laws, County Judge;

(k) Mechanics Lien Actions;

(l) Appeals to the Court of Appeal;

(m) Appeals to the Supreme Court of Canada;

(n) Other contentious proceedings before judicial bodies, the nature of the proceedings to be specified.

4. Give the number of actions, etc., pending at the end of the year under the headings set out in paragraph 3.

5. (a) Give the number of claims against bodies for whom your Department acts referred to insurers in the year;

(b) Give the number of claims against such bodies dealt with by your Department in the year.

6. Give the number of garnishees handled by your Department in the year.

7. Indicate the time spent by members of your Department on Labour Relations matters.

8. Indicate the time spent by members of your Department on pension matters.

9. Give the number of Ontario Municipal Board hearings at which your Department was represented, respecting:

(a) capital works and other undertakings for which the Board's approval is required;

(b) approval of zoning by-laws and amendments therto;

(c) approval of Official Plans and amendments thereto;

(d) approval of plans of subdivision;

(e) other matters.

LEGAL (continued)

10. Give the number of applications made by your Department to other boards or authorities, specifying the names of such boards or authorities.

11. Give the number of by-laws prepared by your Department in the course of the year.

12. Give the number of agreements prepared by your Department in the year under the following headings:

    (a) construction contracts;

    (b) agreements with other Area Municipalities or the Metropolitan Corporation;

    (c) subdivision agreements;

    (d) other agreements.

13. Give the number of real estate transactions completed by your Department in the course of the year under the following headings:

    (a) properties acquired;

    (b) properties sold;

    (c) leases or renewals of leases;

    and indicate the total dollar amount paid or received under (a) and (b).

14. Did your Department apply for or obtain legislation in the year and if so was the legislation drafted by your Department?

<u>PARKS</u> (including combined PARKS AND RECREATION Departments)

To indicate functions please use the following categories:

(1) Care and maintenance of grass;

(2) Care and maintenance of horticultural features (including public displays under glass);

(3) Care and maintenance of trees;

(4) Care and maintenance of greenhouses (used for production purposes);

(5) Care and maintenance of recreation facilities;

(6) Supervision and programming of recreation;

(7) Care and maintenance of equipment used for maintenance purposes;

(8) General development (as defined in question 12, Section II of the Questionnaire).

PLANNING

To indicate functions and workload, please use the following categories. In addition to the information specifically requested under workload, please indicate for each function the amount of staff time spent attending: (a) meetings of your Board; (b) public hearings on planning matters; (c) Ontario Municipal Board hearings; and (d) any other meetings.

Function	Workload
(A) Comprehensive planning (exclusive of fundamental research done to provide a basis for planning decisions):	
(1) preparation of new Official Plan	indicate work done in 1960
(2) preparation of comprehensive Official Plan amendments	" " " " "
(3) preparation of new zoning by-laws or comprehensive zoning amendments	number prepared, scope of each, area covered by each
(4) preparation of community and neighbourhood plans	" " " "
(5) comprehensive planning studies e.g. on parks, schools, servicing, development staging, particular land use problems, etc.	list, indicating scope of each and number of pages in any report published
(6) redevelopment studies	indicate work done in 1960
(B) Current development control:	
(1) subdivision processing	number of applications processed and total number of lots and blocks involved
(2) preparation of routine Official Plan amendments	number prepared
(3) preparation of routine zoning by-law amendments	" "
(4) site plan approvals	number dealt with
(5) road closings	" " "
(6) consents to register	" " "
(C) Research (include here all fundamental research done to provide a basis for any of the other functions):	
(1) research on population and housing	indicate work done in 1960 and number of pages in any reports published
(2) research in other matters, e.g. industry, shopping centres, schools, etc.	" " " " " "

PLANNING (continued)

Function	Workload
(D) Public works programming and capital budgeting	indicate work done in 1960 and number of pages in any reports published
(E) Transportation matters	" " " " "
(F) Public information	number of enquiries
(G) Other functions (specify)	indicate workload using figures where possible

NOTE: If there is a Committee of Adjustment in your municipality, please make sure that a separate copy of Section II of the Questionnaire is completed and returned by it.

PROPERTY

To indicate functions and workload, please give the following;

(1) (a) The number of buildings owned and occupied by the Municipality and managed by the Property Department.

(b) The approximate square footage of floor space therein.

(c) Operating and maintenance costs with respect to same.

(2) (a) The number of properties owned by the Municipality and tenant occupied or available for rent, the management of which is the responsibility of the Property Department.

(b) The approximate square footage of floor space therein.

(3) (a) The number of acquisitions of new properties or interest in properties and disposals of surplus properties handled by the Property Department for each of the years 1952-1960 inclusive.

(b) The amount of money involved with respect to same.

(4) The approximate number of reports to Council and Committees of Council prepared annually covering all property matters.

RECREATION (Separate Recreation Departments only; combined Parks and Recreation Departments see "PARKS".)

To indicate functions, please use the following categories:

(1) Care and maintenance of recreation facilities;

(2) Supervision and programming of recreation;

(3) Care and maintenance of equipment used for maintenance purposes;

(4) General development (as defined in question 12 of Section II of the Questionnaire.)

ROADS

To indicate functions, please use the following categories:

(1) Construction (including design) of new facilities:
Main arterial roads;
Secondary roads;
Bridges;

(2) Reconstruction (including resurfacing) of existing roads:
Main arterial roads;
Secondary roads;
Bridges;

(3) Maintenance (including Winter Maintenance):
Main arterial roads;
Secondary roads;
Bridges;

(4) Administration of the Department.

To indicate workload, please use miles of roads in each case, and number of structures where information is required on bridges.

TRAFFIC

To indicate functions, please use the following categories:

(1) Traffic signals;

(2) Traffic signs;

(3) Pavement markings;

(4) Traffic studies and surveys;

(5) Entrance control;

(6) Traffic by-laws;

(7) Parking meters.

To indicate workload, please give the following:

Traffic Signals

(1) Total number of signals in operation as of December 31, 1960;

(2) These signals are maintained a) by this organization

or b) by .....;

(3) Total annual cost of new signals purchased;

(4) Total annual expenditure for maintenance of signals.

Traffic Signs

(1) Total number of traffic signs in service as of December 31, 1960 (all types);

(2) Total annual cost of new signs purchased;

(3) Total annual expenditure for maintenance of signs.

TRAFFIC (continued)

Pavement Markings

(1) Number of feet of painted centre and lane line applied annually to the pavement (if more than one application, count as added footage);

(2) Number of locations where crosswalks and pedestrian crossovers are painted;

(3) Total annual expenditure for all pavement markings.

Traffic Studies and Surveys

(1) Total number (to include each traffic count, speed study, parking survey, signal survey, etc.).

Entrance Control

(1) Number of applications for vehicular access examined (e.g. service stations, car wash establishments, shopping centres, chain stores, etc.).

Traffic By-laws

(1) Number of traffic by-law amendments processed.

Parking Meters

(1) Total number of parking meters in operation as of December 31, 1960;

(2) These meters are maintained by a) this organization

or by b) .....;

(3) Total annual cost of new meters purchased;

(4) Total annual expenditure for maintenance of meters.

TREASURY

No special function or workload categories are prescribed; each Treasurer should use the categories most appropriate to his Department.

However, the Treasurers of Area Municipalities other than the City of Toronto are requested to provide the following information re: scope and cost of auditing:

(1) List organizations, including all local boards, commissions, etc., for which the books and accounts are audited by your outside auditors.

(2) For the above organizations, list those for whom:

(a) a prepayment audit is done;

(b) a complete detailed audit is done;

(c) a test audit is done.

TREASURY (continued)

(3) For the years 1952 to 1960 inclusive, list special reports requested of the outside auditors.

(4) For the years 1952 to 1960 inclusive, list the total amounts paid to the outside auditors for all services rendered to your municipality and all local boards, commissions, etc. (Note that such auditing services should also be included in the answers to question 5, Section I and question 9, Section II of the Questionnaires returned by the municipality and such local Boards, Commissions, etc.).

(5) Please prepare a separate answer to question 11, Section II of the Questionnaire, indicating any overlapping of the services of your outside auditors with other auditing at the Metropolitan or Area Municipality levels.

(6) If your municipality has an internal audit staff, please have your internal auditor complete and return a separate copy of Section II of the Questionnaire. To indicate functions and workload in answering question 10, he should:

(a) List duties imposed on the Internal Auditor by:

(i) Any Statute and any Regulation therefore;

(ii) Municipal By-laws;

(iii) Instructions of Council;

(iv) Instructions of the Treasurer.

(b) List any other duties or functions.

(c) List all organizations of which an examination is made of the books and accounts.

(d) List by groups the allocation of audits assigned to separate divisions of the staff and the number of employees assigned to each group, accounting for the total employees in the Department.

WELFARE

To indicate functions, please use the following categories:

(1) Welfare Assistance under the General Welfare Assistance Act:

Welfare assistance and welfare services to families and individuals. Supplementary aid in the way of rent supplementation to recipients of old age security, old age assistance, blind persons' allowance and disabled persons' allowance.

(2) Post Sanatoria Care:

Under the General Welfare Assistance Act and subject to the approval of the Medical Officer of Health, allowances to former patients of Sanatoria.

(3) Hospitalization

Investigations as to indigency of patients in hospital who claim to be indigent and who are not insured under the Ontario Hospital Services Commission Plan.

WELFARE (continued)

(4) Funerals and Burial of Indigents.

(5) Nursing Homes:

Placement of citizens in private nursing homes who may not be eligible for admission to a home for the aged. Taking of applications on behalf of citizens for admission to a home for the aged operated by The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

(6) Indigent Homeless Men:

Care for unemployable single men and transients.

(7) Nursery Centres:

The operation of nursery centres under The Day Nurseries Act for pre-school children whose mothers are required to work outside the home.

(8) Day Care Centres:

The operation of day care centres for the care of young school age children of working mothers before and after school and the provision of nutritious noon meals.

(9) Homemakers and Nurses Services:

Provision for the payment of homemakers and home nursing services under the Homemakers and Nurses Services Act, 1958.

(10) Miscellaneous: please specify in list form.

WORKS (Engineering)

In indicating functions, please include all services provided by the Department for other Departments, other municipalities, or private firms. Administration of the Department should be treated as a separate function, including the work of office and drafting personnel, survey crews on normal operations and costs of office operation.

To indicate workload, give the:

(1) Number of bridges,

(2) Miles of roads,

(3) Miles of watermains,

(4) Miles of sewers,

under the jurisdiction of the Department as of December 31, 1960.